

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XI, 2.

WHOLE NO. 42.

I.—SUGGESTIONS ON THE THIRD VOLUME OF KOCK'S FRAGMENTA COMICORUM GRAECORUM.

Menander, fr. 161.

May not the meaning be this? '*quae audaciora sunt, aegre quidem se probant iudiciis vulgi; at simul atque in effectum provehuntur, modo occasione feliciter utantur, solent praeter spem arte adiuvari.*' An adventurous undertaking may fail to convince listeners of its wisdom or feasibility, but for all that in the moment of action sometimes succeeds; only grasp the right opportunity, and you will find expedients will suggest themselves spontaneously in the moment of execution.

Fr. 330. 'Ἄλλ' οὐ τὰ βίου νῦν ἴσως δεῖ φροντίσαι.

Perhaps γὰρ has fallen out after βίου. Such a word would naturally be omitted where, as in the present passage of Priscian (18, 305), a verse is cited merely to illustrate a construction; here the accus. after φροντίζειν.

Fr. 355. οὐ χρήται νόμοις καθ' οὓς κρίνει τὰ πράγματα.

Possibly νόμοις μὲν οὐ χρήθ' οἷς κρίνει τὰ πράγματα.

Fr. 362.

Suidas ἀλφάνει· εὕρισκει· Μένανδρος Ὀμοπατρίοις
ἦν (ἦν) δῆλον οὔτι (οὔνι) νυμφίος τε ἀλφάνει.

Bentley conj. ἦν δηλονοτιῇ νυμφίος τότε ἀλφάνει.

Perhaps ἦν δῆλον οὔτις νυμφίος ὅστις ἀλφάνει.

Fr. 462. τὰς δ' ὀνθυλεύσεις καὶ τὰ κεκαρυκευμένα
μᾶλλον προσεδέξατο χεται Ἀρκαδικὸς τοῦναντίον
ἀθάλαστος ἐν τοῖς λοπαδίοις ἀλίσκεται.

So A, the best MS of Athenaeus. VL give προσεδέξατ' εἰ δέ τις ἔρχεται Ἀρκαδικός. I cannot believe that this χεται or ἔρχεται did not form part of the original tradition of the verse, and would read:

μᾶλλον προσεδέξατ' Ἀρκαδικός τις ἔρχεται
ἀθάλαττος ἐν τοῖς λοπαδίοις ἀλίσκεται.

It is obvious that τούναντίον is not necessary to the sense of the passage, and, if anything, rather spoils its effect.

Fr. 481. ὁ προσδιατρίβων δὲ σκοπιάσας ἀπώλεσε.

Possibly ὁ δὲ προσδιατρίβων σκοπιάσας ἀπώλεσε.

'He who lingers on only squanders and loses what he has.' There seems no more reason to deny that Menander might have used this word than several others not of the most approved Attic currency, e. g. εὐχαριστία fr. 693, and the list contained in Phrynichus Epit. 418 μεσοπορεῖν, γύρος, λήθαργος, σύσσημον, πορνοκόπος, ὀψωνιασμός, ὀψώνιον, δύσριγος (Kock, fr. 1007).¹

Fr. 531. τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον τῶν λόγων, ἄνθρωπος εἶ,
οὐ μεταβολὴν θάττον πρὸς ὕψος καὶ πάλιν
ταπεινότητα ζῶν οὐδὲν λαμβάνει.
καὶ μάλα δικαίως ἄσθενέστατον γὰρ ὅν
φύσει μεγίστοις οἰκονομεῖται πράγμασιν.

Is there not here an *astrological* reference? Man is by nature a very infirm creature, whose horoscope is directed by the greatest powers, i. e. the stars and planets. Anth. Pal. XI 383, 1, 2 Ἦν ἦρα καὶ κάνθωσι (pack-asses) τύχη χαλεπὴ τε καὶ ἐσθλὴ καὶ Κρόνος ὠρονομεῖ τετραπόδων γένεσιν. οἰκειότητα is thought by Kock to be a corruption of ὠραιότητα in the verse quoted by Plutarch, Mor. 769b (Kock, p. 451), οἰκειότητα δ' ἐμβλέπων ὠλίσθανον.

Fr. 532. τὸν δὲ τρόπον αὐτῆς τῆς γαμουμένης μεθ' ἧς
βιώσεται μήτ' ἐξετάσαι μήτ' ἰδεῖν.

Probably οὖν has fallen out between μήτ' and ἰδεῖν.

Fr. 538.

When you wish to know what you really are, look at the tombs.

¹ If it should be thought unlikely that δὲ has got into its position after προσδιατρίβων by an error in the copyist, it would seem possible that the right reading is ὁ προσδιατρίβων δὲ κοπάσας ἀπῆλασε, 'the man who stays longer tires himself out before he starts on his outward journey (takes his departure).' But ἀπώλεσε seems to agree better with the next verse κακῶς τε γηρῶν ἐνδεής πον γίγνεται.

In them lie the dust and bones of the great and wise, men proud of their birth, wealth, or reputation.

κατ' οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς τῶνδ' ἐπήρκεσεν χρόνος.

For χρόνος perhaps we should write ἐπήρκεσ' ἐν χρόνῳ: 'and after all, none of these advantages was of any avail to them at the last.'

Fr. 563. σφάττει με, λεπτὸς γίνομ' εὐωχούμενος
τὰ σκώμμαθ' οἷα τὰ σοφὰ τε καὶ στρατηγικά,
οἷος δ' ἀλαζῶν ἐστὶν ἀλιτήριος.

Read τὰ σκώμμαθ', οἷ' ἄσοφά τε καὶ στρατηγικά.

'The man bores me to death, I am growing lean with the poor jokes he serves up as my meal, so vile, so shallow are they, such utter ignorance of all generalship they betray.' Cic. Att. VIII 16, 1 *Nec uero ille me ducit qui uidetur; quem ego hominem ἀπολιτικώτατον omnium iam ante cognoram, nunc uero etiam ἀστρατηγικώτατον.* The person described in the fragm. would appear to be a sort of Pyrgopolinices or Miles Gloriosus. Such a braggart is described as 'showing his cuts and scars' in fr. 562, where the words ἐγὼ μὲν δεικνύω Ἑσπονδακῶς must, I think, be spoken by the soldier who 'points to his scars in good earnest,' not to a parasite who is describing how he 'showed a serious face' while the braggart was recourting his imaginary exploits (Cobet).

Fr. 688. ἀδικεῖτω με πλούσιος καὶ μὴ πένης
ῥᾶον φέρειν γὰρ κρειττόνων τυραννίδα.

I suggest that the right reading is ἀδικεῖν ἴτω με, a Latinism, *utinam mihi diues, non pauper, iniuriam oblatum eat.*

Fr. 693. ἀπόντι μᾶλλον εὐχαριστίαν ποίει
τῷ γὰρ παρόντι γίνετ' εὐτονώτερον.

Read either ἐντονώτερον 'too emphatic,' and therefore disagreeable as overdone, or ἐπιπονώτερον. But this latter is somewhat far from the letters of the MSS.

Fr. 709. εἰ γάμος ἦν ὁ σφάζων τὴν ἄλλου νόσον
νόσον σφάζων αὐτὸς ἀποθνήσκει νοσῶν.

Read ἱταμός ὁ σφάζων ἦσθα τὴν ἄλλου νόσον.
νόσον σὺ σφάζων αὐτὸς ἀποθνήσκει νοσῶν.

ἱταμός = too forward: ἱταμῶς is found in Alexis and Euphron (fr. I 25).

Fr. 720. παίδων ἐπ' ἀρότῳ γνησίῳνε HICNOPEI
 δίδωμι σοῦγὼ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ θυγατέρα.

The word after γνησίῳν is certainly ἐπὶ σπόρῳ or ἐπὶ σπορᾷ, as Meineke conjectured. And why should this not be added as an explanation of ἐπ' ἀρότῳ? 'for ploughing the soil, for sowing the seed of lawfully-begotten children,' or 'for production of lawfully-begotten children, and engendering of the same.' I see no reason for omitting them as a gloss; they belong to the language of legal formalities, and such forms have a time-honored right of verbiage.

Fr. 939. λυτρωσάμενος τὸν αἰχμάλωτον, ὡς ὁ παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ Δημίας τὴν κράτειαν, ἀπῆλθεν.

The name may have been *Echecratia*. In the MSS of Ibis 293 *Echecratides*, amongst other curious corruptions, assumes the form of *Ecratides*; and such losses of one or more syllables in proper names are familiar to every one versed in MSS of Latin and Greek authors.

Fr. 942. Aristides II 73 Dind.: παρὰ τῷ Μενάνδρῳ μυρία ἂν εὖροις τοιαῦτα, καὶ γυναῖκας λεγούσας καὶ νεανίσκους.

Kock suggests λοχεούσας for λεγούσας; λεγαίνουσας or λαγνεούσας are also possible.

Fr. 1098. ὁ γέλως ἂν μὴ ᾖ τοῦ γέλωτος ἄξιος
 αὐτὸς πέφυκε τοῦ γέλωτος κατάγελως.

Read ὁ γέλως ἂν ᾖ μὴ τοῦ γέλωτος ἄξιος,

'if the laugh does not deserve to raise a laugh (does not deserve its name in consequence of its absurd or weak character), it is by its own nature a mockery of laughter.'

Apollod. Caryst. fr. 5.

οἶμαί γε· πῶς γὰρ μᾶλλον ἂν προείλετο
 Ἑλλῆν ἀληθῶς οὐσα λεπομένους ὄρᾱν
 αὐτοὺς ὑφ' αὐτῶν καὶ καταπίπτοντας νεκρούς,
 ἐξὸν ἱλαροὺς παίζοντας ὑποπεπωκότας
 αὐλουμένους ὦδει;

For ὦδει Kock suggests σποδεῖν, A. Palmer ἰδεῖν. May it not be ὠδί? The construction is ἐξὸν (ὄρᾱν) ἱλαροὺς . . . αὐλουμένους ὠδί, 'listening to flute-players (αὐλουμένους passive) O so jollily.' The ὠδί would be accompanied by a gesture.

Anaxipp. fr. 6.

ζωμήρυσιν φέροις· ὀβελίσκους δώδεκα·
 κρέαγραν· θυῖαν· τυρόκνηστιν ἥ παιδικήν·
 στελεόν· σκαφίδας τρεῖς· δορίδα· κοπίδας τέτταρας.

I suggest either τυροκνήστις (= τυροκνήστεις) παῖ, δέκα, οἱ τυροκνήστεις ἑνδεκα.

Euphron. fr. 6.

καινοὺς πορίζου ἵπρους με θεῶν θεοὺς,
ἵνα τοὺς παλαιοὺς μὴ ἴστωρῃς πολλάκις.

Possibly προσθεωρήσας θεοὺς.

Machon, fr. 1.

τοῦτ' εἴτε πρῶτοι Μακεδόνες τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς
κατέδειξαν ἡμῖν, εἴτε πάντες οἱ θεοί,
οὐκ οἶδα· πλὴν ἐστὶν γε μουσικωτάτου τινός.

πλὴν ἐστὶν γε the best MS of Athenaeus. Kock follows Schweighaeuser in writing οὐκ οἶδα· πλὴν γ' ὅτι μ. τινός. Yet πλὴν ἐστὶν γε has a ring of genuineness not to be gainsaid; either, therefore, it would seem, τινός should be omitted, or μουσικοῦ take the place of μουσικωτάτου.

Fr. 2. εἴθ' ὅπότεν ἤδη πάντα συμφωνεῖν δοκῇς,
εἴσται διὰ πασῶν Νικολάδας Μυκόνιος.

I explain this of the *dates* called by Pliny *Nicolai*. H. N. XIII 45 *sicciores ex hoc genere nicolai, sed amplitudinis praecipuae, quaterni cubitorum longitudinem efficiunt*. The *nicolai* were a dry kind of the class known as *caryota*, and of unusual size. The form *νικολαῖδες* would correspond to *ἀδελφίδες*, another name for a species of date, whose flavor had a *sisterly* resemblance to *caryotae* (Plin. u. s.) They might be called Myconian, as having a *bald* patch; for Strabo tells us, X 487, that τοὺς φαλακροὺς δέ τινες Μυκονίους καλοῦσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸ πάθος τοῦτο ἐπιχωριάζειν τῇ νήσῳ. Hence I would change Μυκόνιος to Μυκονίας. Whether this explanation has been made before I do not know, but it seems at least a plausible one.

Baton, fr. 4.

εὖ γ' ὃ Σιβύνη τὰς νύκτας οὐ καθεύδομεν
οὐδ' ἀναγεγράμμεθ' ἀλλὰ καίεται λύχνος
καὶ βιβλίον ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ, καὶ φροντίζομεν
τί Σόφων καταλελοιπ' ἢ τί Σημωνακτίδης.

Bothe has already corrected ἀναγεγράμμεθ' into ἀνατεγράμμεθ'. I would complete his emendation by altering εὖ γ' into εἰ γ': 'si non dormimus, at nec pessum dati sumus; sed lucubramus.' ἀνατεγράμμεθ' is illustrated by Kock, p. 365: in what sense the cook here uses the

word is doubtful: whether of being ruined and therefore unable to sleep, or 'upset' mentally, or (professionally) worsted by an abler artist. For the construction, cf. Dexicrates fr. 1 (Kock, p. 374), εἰ δὲ μεθύω καὶ χιόνα πίνω καὶ μύρον Ἐπίσταμ' ὅτι κράτιστον Αἴγυπτος ποιεῖ, where, however, the sentence breaks off and the apodosis is wanting.

Baton, fr. 5.

ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ζῆν παγκάλως
εὐσωσιαπαντητυχον δώσεις ἐμοί.

So A in Athen. 203; in 279 A gives

εὖ σῶς ἅπαντας ἡ τυχὸν δ. ἐμοί.

I am dissatisfied with the existing emendations, and venture to believe that ἡ τυχὸν is not likely to have been a corruption of ἀτυχεῖν. At any cost I would retain τυχάν. Possibly the poet wrote

ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ζῆν παγκάλως
εὐκτῶς τε πανταχῇ τυχὸν δώσεις ἐμοί,

sc. εἶναι ἔχειν τὴν ἡδονήν 'but from a life of complete happiness and complete satisfaction you will perhaps concede to me we *may* secure pleasure.' Observe that παγκάλως and πανταχῇ repeat and emphasize the same idea, a life which is happy *all round* and desirable (εὐκτόν) *in every way*.

Epinius fr. 2.

καὶ τῶν ῥυτῶν τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ὄντων τρία
πίνειν δεήσει τήμερον πρὸς κλεψύδραν
κρουνιζόμενον. ἀμφοτέρα δ' οἰωνίζομαι.

Dobree translated οἰωνίζομαι 'I will bet,' too concisely to be intelligible. Judging from the ordinary use of οἰωνίζεσθαι, the meaning, I suppose, is 'I draw an omen from each of the two acts: (1) from the actual drinking; (2) from the way in which the liquor spurts from the ῥυτὸν into the mouth.' If not this, the sense would seem to be 'I make a *forecast* of both acts,' i. e. I give a guess in advance as to the success each toper will have (1) in drinking, e. g. whether he will drink the whole; (2) in the liquor streaming dextrously into his throat or awkwardly.

Damoxenus, fr. 2.

21 αἱ μεταβολαὶ γὰρ αἶ τε κινήσεις κακὸν
ἡλίβατον ἴεσθ' ἀνθρώποις ἀλλοιώματα
ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς ποιοῦσι, μανθάνεις; τὸ δὲ
ληφθὲν καθ' ὥραν ἀποδίδωσι τὴν χάριν.

In 22 ἐστ' is given by A, ἐν τ' by C and Eustathius 1623, 8. Both appear to me to point in the same direction, i. e. to the separation of the clause ending with ἡλίβατον from the clause which follows. For ἐστ' might represent the omitted verb substantive, ἐν τ' might equally express the connexion of ἀνθρώποις with what *follows*, not with what precedes. 'Changes and variations (in the weather and seasons) are a tremendous trouble, and cause alterations in the foods of mankind, do you see?' That is

αἱ μεταβολαὶ γὰρ αἷ τε κινήσεις κακὸν
ἡλίβατον, ἀνθρώποισί τ' ἀλλοιώματα
ἐν ταῖς τροφαῖς ποιῶσι.

31, 32 should perhaps be divided thus:

A. χυμός, λέγει Δημόκριτος—B. οὐδὲν πρᾶγμα τὰ
γινόμενα. A. ποιεῖ τὸν φαγόντ' ἀρθριτικόν.

The first speaker is proceeding to enlarge on Democritus' views of the nature of χυμός, when the other interrupts him, 'never mind what comes of it.' Then the first speaker leaves his high philosophizing and descends to the plain matter-of-fact statement that it is the χυμός of foods which produces gout in the limbs of the epicure.

Nicomachus, fr. 1.

πολλὰς τέχνας λάβοις ἂν ἐνδόξους πάννυ
ῶν τὸν μαθεῖν βουλόμενον ὀρθῶς οὐκ ἐνι
ταύταις προσελθεῖν εὐθύς· ἀλλ' ἐμπροσθε δεῖ
ζωγραφίας ἡφθαι. ταῦτα καὶ μαιγειρικῆς
πρότερον μαθεῖν δεῖ τῆς τέχνης ἑτέρας τέχνας.

Kock considers ῶν to depend on μαθεῖν. To me it seems to depend on ἐμπροσθε, the clause ὀρθῶς οὐκ ἐνι ταύταις προσελθεῖν εὐθύς interrupting the construction, and ἀλλ' returning to it. Of such interrupted constructions there are not a few instances, one of the most famous of which is Thuc. III 82 ξυμμαχίας ἅμα ἑκατέροις τῇ τῶν ἐναντίων κακώσει καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προσποιήσει, where the genitive ξυμμαχίας hardly admits of any tolerable construction unless it depends on προσποιήσει. Besides, in the passage of Nicomachus, the verse which follows, πρότερον μαθεῖν δεῖ τῆς τέχνης ἑτέρας τέχνας is surely an exact parallel to ῶν ἐμπροσθε δεῖ μαθεῖν.

What underlies the corrupt ζωγραφίας ἡφθαι it is now impossible to guess. Probably a considerable number of verses are lost. At least it seems difficult to imagine how either painting could be

introduced as a single representative of all the requisite accessory arts, or how ἄλλων (ἐτέρων) προῆφθαι (Kock) could have assumed so remote a modification as ζωγραφίας ἦφθαι.

- 34-39. τοῖς δὴ τοιούτοις βρώμασιν τὰ φάρμακα
 35 εὖρητ' ἐκείθεν, μεταφορὰ δ' ἐστὶν τέχνης
 ἤδη τὸ μετὰ νοῦ καὶ τὸ συμμετρῶς ἐμὸν
 περὶ τακτικῆς ἕκαστα ποῦ τεθήσεται
 ἀριθμῶ τὸ πλῆθος εἰδέναι μαγειρικῆς
 οὐδεὶς ἕτερός σοι πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ γραφήσεται.

One thing in this passage seems to me certain, that ἐμὸν is a corruption of ἐμείν 'the art of vomiting in an intelligent and graceful way,' which to the Greeks, and far more to the gluttonous Romans, was one of the most essential accomplishments in a diner-out. See the *Satirae* of Petronius. It is, I think, not absolutely beyond doubt that the rest of the passage is wrongly transmitted, or that a lacuna need be assumed after 36. Suppose it punctuated thus:

τοῖς δὴ τοιούτοις βρώμασιν τὰ φάρμακα
 εὖρητ' ἐκείθεν, μεταφορὰ δ' ἐστὶν τέχνης.
 ἤδη τὸ μετὰ νοῦ καὶ τὸ συμμετρῶς ἐμείν.
 περὶ τακτικῆς—ἕκαστα ποῦ τεθήσεται.
 ἀριθμῶ τὸ πλῆθος εἰδέναι ' μαγειρικῆς
 οὐδεὶς ἕτερός σοι πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ γραφήσεται.

Huiusmodi cibis remedia inuenta sunt ex medicina, mutatione facta artium (sc. ex arte coquinaria ad artem medici). *Continuo ut ratione quis uomat et decenter (medicorum artis est): arti* περὶ τακτικῆς *proprium est scire ubi singula ponenda sint: ab* numeris *uenit scire quantum cuiuscumque rei sumendum sit: ut uno* uerbo *omnia exsequar, prae me nemo alius a te in albo inscribetur* *peritorum rei coquinariae.*

Adespot. 662.

οἱ κλεαγόπται λέγεται δὲ καὶ κλέπται. The corrupt κλεαγόπται may have been κληδοκόπται, or possibly κληδαγροκόπται, if we may assume a form κληδάγρα like βαλανάγρα.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

II.—THE SENTENCE-QUESTION IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

Concluding Paper.

G. QUESTIONS WITHOUT A PARTICLE HAVING THE VERB NEAR THE BEGINNING.

In the preceding divisions have been given all the varieties of question which are marked by a distinct relation to the preceding sentence or by the presence of some single word having interrogative or partially interrogative functions. The questions which remain can be distinguished only by peculiarities of order.

For an exhaustive classification it would no doubt be necessary to consider all possible variations from the so-called normal order, especially in the case of pronouns, personal and demonstrative. But the instances would be few in number and the results slight, and I have thought it sufficient to make two divisions according as the verb does or does not retain its normal position at the end of the sentence. A third division might be made of those sentences which consist only of the verb, but most of these have already been given under IV C, *rogas, negas*, etc.

Under the head of sentences in which the verb is near the beginning are included all with *at, sed*, etc., and those in which a subordinate clause precedes the main clause, if it seems clear that the questioning begins only with the main clause. Absolute precision is impossible, e. g. Eun. 705 and 951 are classed here.

As these sentences are similar, except for the absence of the particle, to those in which *ne* is appended to the verb, a comparison of the two kinds may be expected to shed light upon the uses of *ne*, and perhaps upon the origin of the interrogative sentence.

Indic. pres., 1st pers. Andr. 423, *sum verus?* is the only case of *sum*. Eugraph. seems to take it as a declarative sentence (id est 'vera dico'), like the Engl. "I told you so!" As a question it is parallel to Rud. 865, *sumne ibi?* with strong *nonne* effect. Eun. 532, *dico ego mi insidias fieri?* refers back to 507 ff. and means "Am I not right in saying that they are plotting against me?" That is, it has a distinct *nonne* effect; cf. Amph. 433, *vincon*

argumentis, te non esse Sosiam? In other passages the pres. has fut. sense: Most. 774, *eon? voco huc hominem?* || *i voca*, is really only one question, *eon, voco*; Poen. 1224, *pergo etiam temptare?* is confused in the MSS and the text is entirely uncertain; Most. 848, *ergo eo igitur sine perductore?* || *i, licet*, is also confused and is generally printed with a period; Ph. 737, *quid ago?* || . . . || *adeo, maneo, dum haec quae loquitur magis cognosco?* (MSS exc. A have *adeon an*). With *ne* there are six cases parallel to these. Cist. 288 Uss., And. 500 Speng. I should print with a period. Pl. [3], Ter. 2 [3].

Indic. pres., 2d pers., in alphabetical order. Hec. 458, *advenis modo?* "Just come?" is a questioning comment, not a question; cf. Heaut. 883. Amph. 561, *audes mihi praedicare id, domi te esse nunc, qui hic ades?* is similar to *rogas*. Pers. 214, *sed quid tu? confitere, ut te autumo?* is a genuine question, "But what about you? Do you confess . . .?" Also Heaut. 1015 Dz. Eun. 705, *age nunc, bellua, credis huic quod dicat?* is precisely like the cases of *credin*, with the same suggestion of *num* effect. Hec. 803, *adulescens, dic dum quaeso, es tu Myconius?* would be similar to *esne* Men. 1109, but the *vs.* is imperfect; *tun es*, an early conjecture, is generally adopted. Trin. 318, *exprobras, bene quod fecisti?* would be parallel to *rogas*, but I should read *quid exprobras* with Bx. and MSS. Ps. 488, *fatere? dic*, is similar to Capt. 317, *sed faterin . . .?* but there is no necessity for changing to *faterin*, as proposed by Becker, 132; cf. *confitere* above. Heaut. 765, *vah, gloriare evenisse ex sententia?* is not a question, but like *rogas*. Also Heaut. 982, *inrides in re tanta neque me consilio quicquam adiuvas?* Poen. 1103, *intellegis?* at the end of a long explanation, cf. *tenesne, iam tenes, tenes*, is a question, but with some slight *impv.* effect. Heaut. 537, *eho, quaeso, laudas, qui eros fallunt?* is like *rogas*. Pers. 357, *quid? metuis ne te vendam?* Heaut. 1017, *quid? metuis ne . . .?* are influenced by *quid?* and are exclamatory rather than interrogative. So also Aul. 720, *nescis?* (though this may be a repetition), And. 791, *eho inepta, nescis quid sit actum?* and Andr. 348, *obtundis, tam etsi intellego?* (Speng. uses period). Ps. 85, *sed potes nunc mutuum drachumam mihi unam dare, . . .?* is precisely parallel to *potin* with the *infin.* Pers. 733, *redis tu tandem?* is like *advenis modo?* above. Pers. 379, *scis nam tibi quae praecepi?* Eun. 952, 1035, 1036 (twice), Heaut. 529 and Ad. 215 are all parallel to corresponding forms with *scin*. In Heaut. 529,

scis esse factum ut dico? the *nonne* effect is produced by *ut dico*. Ps. 216 (Lor. Goetz, period), Heaut. 700, Ph. 214, *tenes?* are like *tenesne*, Heaut. 778. Ps. 1157, *vides, iam die (diem Lor.) multum esse?* is parallel to *viden* with infin. having *nonne* effect. Most. 1105, *aspicedum contra me. || aspexi. || vides?* || *video* is not quite clear without the stage "business," but is apparently exclamatory. Andr. 898, *impera. vis me uxorem ducere? hanc vis mittere? ut potero, feram*; the corresponding forms with *vin* imply an offer of service, these are more nearly neutral, and so have the effect of a protasis with *feram* for apodosis.

Pl. 12 [13], Ter. 19 [20].

Indic. pres. 3d pers. Ad. 924, *iubet frater?* These are the first words of a scene and are probably meant as a repetition of words supposed to have been spoken off the stage. Ph. 352, *negat Phanium esse hanc sibi cognatam Demipho? hanc Demipho negat esse cognatam?* These are both exclamatory and similar to repetitions. Men. 923, *dic mihi hoc: solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri?* and Poen. 755, *valent apud te quos volo?* are unemotional questions for information, as are two cases of *licet*, Curc. 621 and Mil. 1329, and one of *placet*, Ad. 736. Rud. 803, *licet sallem istas mi appellare?* I should punctuate with period because of *saltem*.

In Amph. 995, *amat? sapit*, Eun. 252, *negat quis? nego: ait? aio*, the questions stand for protases and may be punctuated *amat: sapit*. The usage is well known.

Instances of *est (sunt)* are Aul. 357, Men. 1107 (twice), Merc. 563, Poen. 165, 253 (*adsunt*), Ad. 556, 778, And. 789. In St. 186, *promitte vero: ne gravare: est commodum?* (so Rit. Goetz) I should prefer a period. All these are regular questions, absolutely the same as similar forms with *estne*; cf. e. g. Heaut. 454, *estne ea intus?* with And. 789, *est Simo intus?*

Pl. 11 [13], Ter. 8.

Indic. impf. Ad. 693, *quid? credcbas dormienti haec tibi confecturos deos?* Ph. 902, *verebamini ne id non facerem quod recepissem semel?* (Dz. *an rebamini*, v. Krit. Anh.) Both are exclamatory.

Ter. 2.

Indic. fut. Truc. 206, *ibo igitur intro? || quippini?* is parallel to Mil. 1242, *adibon*; both are unusual because of the tense. Hec. 672, *quid dixti? eho, an non alemus, Pamphile? prodemus, quaeso, potius?* is exclamatory, as if repeated from a previous

speech. Curc. 73, Ad. 192 are exclamatory and properly future. On *obtundes* ? or *obtundis* ? Ph. 515, see under IV C.

Pl. 2, Ter. 2 [3].

Indic. perf. In the 1st person only Cas. V 4, 18, beside those already given under IV B. In the 2d pers. the only clear cases are Mil. 829, *prompsisti tu vinum* ? Poen. 723, *vidistis leno quom aurum accepit* ? and Rud. 378, *cavistis ergo tu atque erus ne abiret, . . .* ? In other cases the MSS vary. Most. 594, Epid. 539, 554, Cist. III 15 are entirely uncertain. In Aul. 171, And. 975, Eun. 692, Heaut. 684, 731 the metrical probabilities favor the forms without *ne* ; in Mil. 556 A has *vidisti*, and so Bx. Lor. In spite of the uncertainty (see above I. A, *ne* with the perf. indic.), it is clear that the forms without *ne* are regular questions ; indeed, the uncertainty itself shows that there is no difference in sense between the questions with *ne* and those without *ne*. In the 3d pers. Heaut. 978, *abiit* ? is exclamatory, recognizing a fact, not asking a question. Hec. 527, *peperit filia* ? *hem, taces* ? is usually printed with colon ; I can see no reason why a question mark should not be used. Some other cases have been given under IV B.

Pl. 6, Ter. 6.

Plupf. Eun. 429 is exclamatory.

Periphrastic forms are Ad. 796, *dictum hoc inter nos fuit . . .* ? *responde*, And. 665, *factum hoc est, Dave* ? || *factum* ; these are regular questions, though the first has *nonne* effect. And. 751, *dictura es quod rogo* ? has impv. force, but see above I. A, *ne* with fut. ptc. Rud. 982, *quid ais, . . .* ? *ausu's etiam conparare vidulum cum piscibus* ? (Seyffert, Sch., *ausis*). Pl. 1, Ter. 3.

Subjunctive pres. Men. 539, *dicam curare* ? Bacch. 65 ff., *adulescens homo penetrem me huiusmodi in palaestram, . . .* ? Ad. 625, *nunc quid faciam* ? *dicam fratris esse hanc* ? And. 640, Eun. 49, Ph. 186, *quid remedium inveniam . . .* ? *loquarne* ? *incendam* : *taceam* ? *instigem* : *purgem me* ? *laterem lavem*. This last has the force of a condition. In the 2d pers. Asin. 878, *possis, si forte . . . videas, cognoscere* ? cf. Merc. 518, *possin*, with the same sense. Asin. 814, 815. Impf. Ad. 395 ; Wag. Fleck. Dz. insert *num*. All these have precise parallels with *ne*.

Pl. 5, Ter. 5 [6].

Summing these up it appears, in the first place, that about one-third, including most of the sentences which consist of the verb alone, are not properly interrogative, but exclamatory, and closely related to repetitions and to *rogas* ? and *negas* ? So *advenis*

modo ? means "Just come, have you?" not "Have you just come?" *abiit* ? means "He's gone?" cf. *satin abiit* ? and *quid metuis . . .* ? is "What! you're afraid that . . .?" The large preponderance of cases from Ter. is partly due to the fact that he uses exclamations (cf. *rogas*, *rogilas*) more frequently than Pl. These exclamations have few parallels among questions with *ne* appended to the verb.

In the second place, of the cases which have parallels in questions with *ne*, nearly all are unemotional questions, asked for information. These comprise about half of the whole number, and the correspondence between them and forms with *ne* is so close as to make it plain that *ne* is not at all necessary to an unemotional question. Pl. could say *est* or *estne* without difference of meaning. Nor is *ne* essential in all idiomatic and emotional forms of question; the effect of *num* is given without it (*credis* = *credin*), and the effect of *nonne* in about half a dozen cases. Of impv. questions, however, there are no clear cases, and there are comparatively few idioms, like those with *ain*, *audin*, *scin*, *viden*; the few cases that do occur are of the simplest sort. While, therefore, *ne* is not essential to the genuine question nor even to some kinds of idiom, it appears that the widest development of idiomatic questions is to be found only in connection with *ne*. But because of the small number of questions without *ne* this conclusion should not be pushed too far.

H. SENTENCES HAVING THE VERB NEAR THE END.

Under this head are placed also the few cases in which the verb is neither at the beginning nor at the end, for which it has not seemed necessary to make separate classes.

So far as these sentences correspond to questions with *ne*, given in the various sub-classes I. B-K, the parallels will be pointed out. Of the sentences which have no parallels with *ne*, which are too numerous to be given in full, sufficient illustrations will be given.

Indic. pres. 1st pers. And. 906, *Andrium ego Critonem video* ? *certe is est*, corresponds in sense to *videon* in soliloquy. Heaut. 579, *Clitipho, haec ego praecipio tibi* ? is parallel to *haecine*, c. g. Most. 25 f., with rejecting effect. There is no case parallel to Ph. 812, *hanc igitur mittimus* ? And. 921, *ego istaec moveo aut curo* ? Eun. 179 (and Hec. 875 without verb) are exactly like Ph. 999, *egon timeo* ? i. e. they repeat and reject an idea already suggested. Merc. 172, *tandem indignus videor* ? if the text is correct, is

exclamatory, as is Andr. 500, *inrideor?* which only Speng. prints as question. Amph. 391, Cas. V 4, 28, *tuae fidei credo?* || *meae*, are hesitating declarative sentences, "I trust to your honor?" not as Uss. says, equivalent to *credamne*, and entirely different from Andr. 497.

Pl. 3, Ter. 6.

Pres. indic., 2d pers. Ad. 596, *id quia non est a me factum, agis gratias?* has some questioning effect, due perhaps to the fact that the verb stands first in the main clause. Ph. 985, *rape hunc*. || *sic agitis?* is exclamatory and rejecting, but has many parallels with *ne*, e. g. Ad. 128, Eun. 99, *sicine agis?* Men. 1108, *patrem fuisse Moschum tibi ais?* and Andr. 908 do not differ greatly from *ain* with infin. Men. 741 (*attines*) is exclamatory. Asin. 485 (see above under *ain*), Men. 514, 924, Rud. 1099, Trin. 695, Hec. 675, Andr. 545, all with *censes*, are like *censen* in having a rejecting force which comes partly from the sense of *censeo*, but differ from *censen* in being less distinctly interrogative; cf. also Andr. 505. Eun. 897 (*cogitas*) is like *censes*. Capt. 556, Trin. 649, Ad. 748, Eun. 245, Heaut. 729, all with *credis*, have an infin. and exclamatory effect, except Capt. 556, which corresponds pretty closely to Eun. 812, *credin?* with interrogative force. Ps. 1315, *at negabas daturum esse te mihi: tamen das?* is really declarative, with slight interrogative inflection. All cases of *dan* have impv. effect. Hec. 524, . . . *mi vir* || *vir ego tuos sim?* *tu virum me aut hominem deputas adeo esse?* is exclamatory and has parallels with *tun*. Men. 1139, *hanc tu dicis, frater, pallam, . . .?* (Fleck. Rit. *hancine*, which would be equally correct in sense), Merc. 912, Trin. 466, Heaut. 596, 888, all with *dicis*, are declarative with slight questioning or exclamatory inflection; *dicisne*, used only twice, is impv. Ad. 104, *tu nunc tibi id laudi ducis, quod tum fecisti inopia?* is exclamatory, like *rogas*. Andr. 321, *hodie uxorem ducis?* || *aiunt*, is almost declarative, with faint questioning inflection. With *es*, Men. 1078, *quae haec fabulast?* *tu's Menaechmus?* is an exclamatory repetition; Trin. 987, *ipsus es?* and Poen. 866, *malus es?* are questioning; Rud. 1305 is so nearly declarative that it might equally well be printed with a period; Trin. 635, *tu mihi es melior quam egomet mihi?* (Rit.³ *tun*) has been given under *tun*, but in either case it would be exclamatory. I should read *tu* with Bx., but without accepting his reason (Krit. Anh.), "da die energische Frage ohne *ne* für den Ausdruck des Unwillens viel angemessener ist." Ad. 167, *ceterum hoc nili facis?* is exclamatory. Umpf. uses a period.

Ad. 769, *ohe iam : tu verba fundis hic sapientia ?* is exclamatory. Heaut. 718, *tantum sat habes ?* is exclamatory, not questioning like *satin habes, si*. Asin. 579, *hoc quod rogo responde. || rogita quod vis. || argenti viginti minas habes nunc ?* (so Müll., Goetz. MSS *habesne*). The position of *habesne* is without a parallel in Pl., but Müller's reading is not at all satisfying; *habes nunc* would be almost a declarative sentence, while the context calls for a formal and unemotional question, like those with *haben*. Pers. 850, *inrides*, and Ad. 135, *irascere*, are like *rogas*. Heaut. 315, *hoc vide : in mea vita tu tibi is quaesitum, scelus ?* is exclamatory; *in (isne)* has impv. force. Asin. 593, *salve. || salvere me iubet, quoi tu abiens adfers morbum ?* usually printed with period, is like *rogas*, as is Eun. 1053, *laudas*. Merc. 160, *dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites ?* is half-declarative. Ps. 442, *mirare*, And. 764, *nescis*, Most. 16, *obiectas*, Rud. 876, *opsecras* (Vulg. Sch. with period), Asin. 189, Cist. Frag. IX, Ben., *postulas*, Truc. 413, *procuras* (Sch. prints as exclamation) are all either exclamatory or declarative. Merc. 654, *cedo . . . amorem te hic relicturum putas ?* has considerable questioning force, due probably to *cedo*. Heaut. 741, *dignam me putas . . . ?* Amph. 284, are like *censes*. Eun. 426, *lepus tute es : pulpamentum quaeris ?* might as well be declarative; cf. Wagner's note. Amph. 816, *quaeris*, is exactly like *rogas*. Asin. 398, *tu id nunc refers ?* is like cases with *tun*, expressing rejection. Hec. 706, Ph. 684, *respondes*, are like *taces, rogas*. Aul. 214, Poen. 724, Heaut. 181, *scis (scitis)*, differ from *scin* in that they take the knowledge for granted and are only slightly interrogative. In Merc. 719, *sic tu me temptas sciens ?* there is less emphasis upon *sic* than in questions with *sicine*, but the rejecting force is the same. Cist. Frag. II Ben., *quid ? tuam times amicam . . . ?* and Heaut. 910, *quid ? istuc times . . . ?* are exclamatory. Ad. 233, *nunc demum venis ?* is partially declarative. Ph. 60, *verere*, is like *metuis, times* and other verbs of emotion. With *vis* the case is less clear. Men. 1155, *ergo nunc iam vis conclamari auctionem fore ?* Rud. 1074, And. 708 all have questioning force, and in all *vis* precedes the dependent verb, infin. or subjunct. So also in Hec. 787, where A has . . . *ob eam rem. || vin ergo intro eam ?* the other MSS || *ob eam rem vis ergo intro eam ?* which latter I believe to be correct. Heaut. 87, *scire hoc vis ?* takes up *fac me ut sciam* of 84, and has very little questioning force. Pers. 681, *quod te dignumst, me dignum esse vis ?* is exclamatory and rejecting. Most. 262, *scita's tu qui-*

dem. nova pictura interpolare vis opus lepidissimum? is so clearly declarative that it might better have a period. Mil. 68 (I 1, 38) and Ps. 47 have been given above. Men. 848, *votas*, is like *rogas*, and Ritschl's conj. *men* is unnecessary. Ps. 826, *utere*, is repudiating, with some slight questioning force from *quid tu?*

In 2d pers. Pl. 40, Ter. 32.

In the cases which follow it is not necessary to do more than indicate the general group, questioning, exclamatory or declarative, to which the sentence seems most nearly allied, and even this general grouping cannot be precise, since these three tendencies may all appear in a single sentence.

In the 3d pers. pres. indic. Ad. 246, *omnes dentes labefecit, . . . : etiam insuper defraudat?* is the nearest representative of the interrogation. Five with *videtur*, Ba. 854, Ps. 472, Rud. 983, 1230, Ph. 1033, and Ad. 736, *placet*, are exclamatory and rejecting. Curc. 572, Aul. 720, Hec. 500 (Wag. with period), and Merc. 714 are declarative with slight questioning or exclamatory force. In Merc. 714 a period would express the sense equally well. Merc. 948, Truc. 585, Cas. 353 Gepp. are entirely uncertain. Eun. 733 is given under *multon*, Ps. 1002, And. 949 under *non*.

Cases with *est* are more frequent, and about half have an introductory phrase or semi-parenthetic verb like *quaeso*, *opsecro*. Interrogative are Amph. 774, *salvom signumst?* || *inspice*. || *recte*, Ba. 718, *nulla*, Epid. 643, Rud. 284, 1054. The exclamatory sentences are mainly repetitions, Ad. 950, . . . *paulum* . . . || *paulum id autemst?* Merc. 534, 974, Most. 628, Pers. 491, Rud. 740, 1399, And. 875; these are repetitions with *est* added. Ad. 707 is like *hocine*; Hec. 527 like *istucine*; Bacch. 616, Rud. 960, Heaut. 607 have slight interrogative force, and so resemble adjectives with *ne*. Ps. 294 (2), Rud. 1113, Ad. 388, Heaut. 583 are rejecting exclamations. Most. 444, *sed quid hoc? occlusa ianuast interdus?* is usually printed with period, but is like other partially declarative sentences. So also Eun. 1040.

Pl. 24, Ter. 12.

Indic impf. Eun. 155, *aut ego nescibam quorsum tu ires?* (So Umpf. *at*, with period, Bent. Wag. Dz.) This is an ironical declarative sentence, and approaches a question, though not closely enough to warrant the interrogative sign. Men. 1122, *dic mihi: uno nomine ambo eratis?* is clearly interrogative. Men. 625, Pers. 686, Ad. 901, Ph. 858 are exclamatory. Heaut. 907, *hem, Clinia haec fieri videbat?* is a hesitating assertion. Pl. 3, Ter. 3 [4].

Indic. fut. Mil. 1021, *quid ego? hic astabo . . .?* Rud. 658, Curc. 204 are rejecting exclamations. Rud. 1270 has more questioning force. In 2d pers. Capt. 892, Merc. 649, Eun. 690, Hec. 232 are strongly repudiating. Aul. 773, 774 are in a series of questions which demand a promise rather than ask for a reply. They are imperative futures with slight interrogative inflection. In Eun. 536 the MSS favor *malam rem hinc ibis?* with impv. effect; this is without parallel, but Ter. shows considerable variety in impv. questions. In the 3d pers. Poen. 729, *quid si . . . pullem?* || *censeo. || si pullem, non recludet?* is equivalent to *quid si pullem atque ille non recludet?* Merc. 458, 459, Eun. 638 are exclamatory. In Cas. III 5, 38 *ne* is called for by the metre. Men. 792, . . . *ibi potat. || tua quidem ille causa potabit minus, . . .?* is exactly like Capt. 845, Pers. 747, and Rit. has *tuan* here also; but *ne* is not at all necessary to the sense.

Pl. 12, Ter. 4.

Indic. perf. Men. 394 is exclamatory and is in sense a repetition; Cas. V 4, 16, *ego istuc feci?* is an exclamation with precisely the same sense as *egon*. Asin. 410, *hodie salvere iussi Libanum libertum? iam manu emissust?* is an ironical assertion with slight interrogative force. Eun. 420, *quid illud, Gnatho, quo pacto Rhodium tetigerim in convivio, numquam tibi dixi?* involves an anacoluthon, and the strong interrogative force is due to that fact.

Indic. perf. 2d pers. Interrogative effect is somewhat distinct in Epid. 596 (with *quid*), Mil. 1219 (with *opsecro*), Poen. 759, Heaut. 884 (both with *dic mihi*), Heaut. 830. On Andr. 742 see *tun*; for Ph. 577 see perf. with *ne*. The following are repudiating exclamations: Amph. 725 (cf. 717), Asin. 926, Capt. 717, Pers. 798, Rud. 993, Trin. 138, Eun. 241, Heaut. 685, Ph. 467. The declarative force is prominent in Asin. 252 f. (only Uss. prints as question), Asin. 416, Most. 1010 (both of these might as well have a period, since the interrogative effect is barely perceptible), Poen. 591, And. 586. Cist. II 3, 39 is entirely confused.

In the 3d pers. Asin. 432, *eho, Coriscus pro vectura olivi rem soluit?* || *soluit*, 441, *Dromo mercedem rettulit?* are interrogative, but they have an intentionally peremptory tone, as from a superior to an inferior; cf. 444, where *rettulitne* is at the end of the sentence.¹ Bacch. 502 is equivalent to a condition. Mil. 1043, And.

¹ Other cases where the omission of *ne* appears to be associated with an urgent and peremptory tone are And. 665, *factum hoc est, Dave?* 751, *dic-*

241 are exclamations. Most. 977, 978, Pers. 131 are assertions which get a slight interrogative tone from the context.

Pl. 23, Ter. 8.

Indic. plupf. only in Ad. 465, *noras*, with declarative force.

Ter. 1.

Indic. fut. pf. Truc. 547, where Speng. uses period. Pl. 1.

Compound forms are all in the perfect. Rud. 187 is exclamatory, but the text is somewhat uncertain. St. 372, *hem, quid? Epignomum elocutus?* is like *ais*, referring to what has just been said. Heaut. 522, *faceta haec meretrix. || sane. || idem visast tibi?* "You think so too?" has as much questioning force as any; the rest are clearly exclamatory or declarative, Cist. II 1, 16, Epid. 650 (*quid?*), Heaut. 580, Merc. 976, Asin. 330, Men. 611, Capt. 568, Ps. 631; in the last four I should use a period.

Pl. 9, Ter. 2.

With the subjunctive a dependent infin. is rarely used, and the sentences are for the most part so short that the position of the verb cannot be expected to have much influence upon the meaning.

Subj. pres., 1st pers. Bacch. 903, *hodie exigam aurum hoc?* || *exige*, and Trin. 59, *vin conmutemus? tuam ego ducam et tu meam?* are the only cases which have any questioning force. The rest are all exclamatory and rejecting, like *egone* with the pres. subj. They are Asin. 506 (Goetz *ubi*), Aul. 45, Capt. 139 (Sch. *egone*), Pers. 26, Poen. 352, 730, Ps. 318, St. 297, And. 231, Eun. 798, Heaut. 131, 413, Hec. 434, Ph. 419, 1022.

With the 2d pers. all cases are exclamatory and correspond to *tun* with subjunct. They are Asin. 489, 812 (?), Merc. 575, And. 619, Eun. 460, Hec. 589.

With the 3d pers., all exclamatory, Curc. 193, Truc. 754, Heaut. 128 ff., Ph. 813. Also Hec. 878, Dz.; Um. *an*.

In the impf. all are exclamatory, and repeat with more or less of distinctness a suggestion already expressed: Most. 183, Rud. 842 (Sch. *quid ego*, etc., without any mark after *quid*), Truc. 625. Truc. 501 is utterly confused; Aul. 286 should have a period; Trin. 957, where the MSS have *mihi*, Rit. Bx. *mihin concrederet*, has been placed under *mihin*, I. B, because there is no precise

tura es quod rogo? Mil. 829, *prompsisti tu illi vinum?* 833, *neque tu bibisti?* I have noted no cases exactly like those in the Asin., and this suggestion may be fanciful, but an assertive form of question might easily be rudely and harshly employed.

parallel without *ne*, yet I greatly doubt whether *ne* is at all necessary. A few of these cases have been given above, IV B and D.

Pl. 17, Ter. 13.

As has been remarked, these sentences exhibit three tendencies. They are (*a*) declarative sentences with slight interrogative inflection, (*b*) exclamations, mostly with repudiating effect, or (*c*) questions like those in the preceding class. These are not different kinds of questions, but merely different uses to which this one kind of sentence may be put. Of the declarative sentences there are about 40 cases. They are nothing more than ordinary declarations, made with some hesitation, which was no doubt expressed by the voice, but was not sufficiently strong or not sufficiently concentrated upon any single word to bring about a change from the normal position of the verb in a declarative sentence. In fact, as in sentences with *scilicet*, *fortasse* or a parenthetic *credo* (see IV A), the hesitation was not about any single word, but about the correctness of the statement as a whole. The exclamations, which include about 140 of the 200 cases, are like the other kinds of exclamatory sentence already given and express doubt or wonder or absolute incredulity by repeating with exclamatory inflection the statement which has excited the emotion. In most cases they repudiate the statement. Even in the third use, in the 20 or 25 cases which most nearly approach a real interrogation, something of declarative or exclamatory effect generally appears, indicating that these are essentially like the other uses, and differ from them less widely than they do from sentences in which the inflection has been strong enough to bring the verb to the first place in the sentence. In most cases, also, the interrogation is partly expressed by *quaeso*, *dic*, *opsecro* and similar words, making the question semi-indirect.

In general, therefore, there is in questions which have the verb at or near the end a correspondence between form and function; they are declarative sentences with exclamatory inflection, or with a questioning inflection too slight to bring about a departure from the declarative order.

V.—QUESTIONS WITH *ut* AND WITH THE INFINITIVE.

Questions with *ut* interrogative and the indic. are merely a variety of the *quis*-question, and of these I have made no lists. Apparently, in passing over these, I have omitted also cases of *ut* with the subjunct., which should have been noted for the sake

of comparison with *egon ut* sentences, and I fear that the following list is imperfect. Amph. 694, *quid enim censes? te ut deludam contra, . . .?* Trin. 750, *ut ego nunc adulescenti thesaurum indicem . . .?* Cist. IV 1, 10, And. 618, *oh, tibi ego ut credam, furcifer?* Heaut. 1050, *mea bona ut dem Bacchidi dono sciens?* In 2d pers. pres., Poen. 316, perf. Men. 683, 3d pers. pres. Ad. 238, Ph. 669, perf. Most. 14 (L²), 1017, Ad. 530, Heaut. 954, Hec. 138 f. Most. 1172 is purely conjectural. Ad. 655 repeats 654.

Questions or exclamations with the infin. have been partly given under *hicine, ilane* and other words, but are repeated here in order to bring all infin. questions together.

With *adeon* followed by an *ut*-clause, Bacch. 283, *adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem . . .?* And. 245, Eun. 225, Heaut. 980, Hec. 532, Ph. 153, 497, 499. In And. 879 all MSS have *adeon* against the metre, generally corrected to *adeo*; it will be seen from cases below that there is nothing remarkable in the omission of *ne*.

With *itane*, Ph. 810, *itan parvam mihi fidem esse apud te?* Ph. 466. With *ita*, Heaut. 503.

With *sicine*, Curc. 589, Pers. 42, And. 689; with *sic*, Ph. 528 U.

With some form of *hicine*, Asin. 226, *haecine te esse oblitum . . .?* Curc. 694 (for Curc. 200 see I. H. e), Mil. 626, Ps. 202, Truc. 537, 933, Ad. 237, 390, 408, 611, Eun. 644, Heaut. 401. The only cases without *ne* which at all correspond to these are Ph. 503, . . . *tum hoc esse mihi obiectum malum?* and Hec. 613, *hinc abire matrem? minime*. (There is no case of *hincine*.)

Other pronominal forms are *istacine* Aul. 746, *illan* (abl.) Ad. 448, *quemquamne* Ad. 38, Heaut. 912, *neminemne* Eun. 553, *nosne* Hec. 645, *ten* Ph. 339 (cf. Ps. 371), *meamne* Mil. 488, *nullane* And. 425, *tantamne* And. 253, *tantane* Ph. 977. Also *numquamne* (adv.) Eun. 360. Without *ne*, Capt. 783, *ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi hodie?* Also with *tantum*, *tantam*, And. 870, Heaut. 630, Ph. 884; in Heaut. 92, *hui, tam gravis hos, quaeso?* the infin. is to be supplied.

With *nilne*, And. 716; with *nil*, Ph. 1042.

With *non* (*nonne* does not occur with the infin.), Trin. 1046, *non hoc publice animadvorti?* Cas. I 1, 1, Hec. 227, Ph. 231, 232, 978, Ad. 562, 629, Dz.

With *magistron* Bacch. 151, *servon* And. 609.

The other cases without *ne* are Asin. 127, which may be a

continuation of the preceding question, Aul. 338, *tibi recte facere?* Curc. 623, *servom antestari?* Eun. 391, *magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?* This appears to be a repetition of a preceding infin. which Gnatho had used just before the speakers came upon the stage. Heaut. 94 is a repetition in infin.

With *ne*, Pl. 12, Ter. 28.

Without *ne*, Pl. 6, Ter. 18.

The use of the infin. in exclamations calls for no comment, but it may be noted that the greater number of these exclamations are associated with special words, *adeo*, *ita*, *sic*, *hic* and other demonstratives and the negative. This points to a close relationship to the forms given under I. B. Also, while *ne* is more often used than omitted, there is no form of question, except that with *non*, which has not a moderately close parallel without *ne*.

VI.—*An* AND DISJUNCTIVE QUESTIONS.¹

The received doctrine concerning *an* is thus summarized by Schmalz, Syntax, p. 299: "Unstreitig die wichtigste Fragepartikel ist *an*; im vollständig ausgesprochenen disjunktiven Fragesatze leitet es, wie wir gesehen, den zweiten Teil der Frage ein. Aber wie wir nicht in vollständigen Syllogismen sprechen, sondern eine oder die andere Prämisse unterdrücken, so genügt oft auch—wie oben bei *utrum* bemerkt—ein Teil der disjunktiven Frage, in der Regel der zweite. Und so steht *an* scheinbar in einer einfachen Frage. Dieser Gebrauch findet sich schon bei den Komikern, hat aber seine höchste Ausbildung in der Sprache Ciceros erreicht."

For reasons which will be given later, and especially because a prejudgment of the case may be thus avoided, I shall give first the simple questions with *an*, those which are commonly regarded as the second part of an incomplete disjunctive question, and afterward the complete questions with *utrum—an*. The connection between *an* and *av*, and the derivation of both from a pronomi-

¹ It was not until after the following pages were in the hands of the Editor of this Journal that I obtained the dissertation of P. Hinze, *de an* partic. ap. prisc. script. Lat. vi et usu, Halle, 1887, also as program, Brandenburg, 1887. Hinze classifies the examples according to the presence or absence of *eho*, *autem*, etc., and includes the indirect questions, thereby adding considerably to the weight of the argument. But in the main his classification and results anticipate what is given here. I have left my own work as it was written, with the addition of a note or two, partly for the sake of completeness, partly in the hope of reaching a different circle of readers.

nal stem *an*, "that" or "the other, the second," seems to be generally accepted, and, in accordance with this etymology and with the actual usage in Latin, the relation between the *an*-question and the preceding sentence is made the basis of the classification.

(a). The question with *an* is at the beginning of a speech and refers back to what has been said by the previous speaker.

In these cases the leading verb of the preceding sentence is never repeated without change in the *an*-question. (For Bacch. 1162 see below.) If the idea of the leading verb is repeated, it is always with some change of phrase, and this change seems to be intentional and to be essential in a question with *an*. Generally, however, the idea which is taken up and questioned is a subordinate one in the preceding sentence.

The idea of the main verb is repeated with change of phrase in Mil. 822, *sorbet dormiens . . .* || *quid 'sorbet'?* || *illud stertit volui dicere . . .* || *eho, an dormit Sceledrus intus?* Most. 454, *paene confregi . . . foris.* || *eho, an tu tetigisti has aedis?*

In most cases some secondary idea is questioned. Asin. 837, *credam . . ., si te hilarum videro.* || *an tu me tristem putas?* Mil. 419, . . . *si quidem east.* || *an dubium id tibi est eam esse hanc?* Ps. 309, *te vivom vellem.* || *eho, an iam mortuost?*

The other cases, differing in no essential particular from these, are Amph. 745, 773, 964, Bacch. 120, 143, 200, Epid. 506, Merc. 393, Mil. 840, Most. 1083, Pers. 855, Poen. 334, 991, 1067, 1136, 1227, Ps. 314, 851, 853, 872, 1161, 1172, Rud. 578 (1274 given below), St. 34, 246, Trin. 371, 637, 934, 942, 943, Truc. 141, 165, Ad. 128, 389, 672, And. 500, 784 [possibly *ain tu haec omnia?*], Eun. 382, 604, 679, 733, Heaut. 81, 911, 990, 1057, Ph. 235, 259, 626, 902, 1009.

Also *an quid*, Asin. 717, Merc. 145, Ps. 29, Ad. 468, *an quippiam*, Cas. III 5, 38. In Trin. 1018 ff., because of the long intervening clauses, a question beginning with *an* is renewed with *eosne*.

The following are semi-indirect, i. e. they depend upon or contain *dic*, *opsecro*, *quaeso*: Asin. 894, Cist. I 1, 70, II 3, 22, Merc. 145, 538, Most. 519, Poen. 475, Ps. 29, Rud. 351, Trin. 986, Eun. 963.

With *non*, Bacch. 121, *an deus est ullus Suavisaviatio?* || *an non putasti esse umquam?* Mil. 301, Poen. 490, Ps. 969, Ad. 136, And. 766, 781, 807, Eun. 959, Hec. 100. In Poen. 490 *non* is separated from *an*, and there is no resemblance in any of the

passages from Pl. to *an non* in the second half of a disjunctive question; in the more numerous Ter. passages the verb is sometimes repeated and the questions are like the common *an non* use.

All the conditions of the use of *an* are satisfied in Most. 178 (MSS omit), Poen. 533 (MSS *at, ad*); in Mil. 217 the text is confused and *an* is unlikely; in Trin. 922 Spengel's emendation (v. Bx.³) is at least as good as anything. In Ps. 472 I should retain *iam* of the MSS, but *an* (Lor.) would give an excellent sense. *An* is especially liable to confusion with *ain*? both in form and in use. The distinction is this, that *ain*? introduces a repetition, generally an exact repetition, while *an* introduces an interpretation with changed phraseology. The two cases in which the reading of the MSS is opposed to this rule are Bacch. 1162, *quid multa? ego amo.* || *an amas?* where I should read *ain? amas?* and Asin. 812, *ain tu?* which Uss., Langen, Beitr. 199, change to *an*. In Aul. 538, *edi sermonem tuom.* || *an audivisti?* Goetz follows Gruter and Bentley in changing to *ain? audivisti?* I should follow the MSS, with hiatus in the change of speakers, because of the change from a more involved to a plainer phrase; cf. esp. Mil. 822 and St. 246, *eho, an audivisti?*

At the beginning of a speech, Pl. 58 [61], Ter. 25.

Looking at these questions by themselves, without reference to the complete disjunctive sentence, the sequence of thought is this: one speaker implies, in the course of what he says, an opinion which excites the surprise or incredulity of the other, who in the *an* sentence questions the correctness of the suggested opinion. This he may do in such a way as to imply that he himself was mistaken, or that the other speaker was mistaken, or he may leave the matter entirely in doubt. In Most. 519, *an quaeso tu appellaveras? ita me di amabunt, mortuom illum credidi expostulare*, Tranio at first pretends to believe that the ghost had called him (*heus, Tranio*, 515), but when Theopropides says *quicum istaec loquere?* he is convinced of his error. So Amph. 964, *me . . . dixisse per iocum.* || *an id ioco dixisti? equidem hercle serio ac vero ratus.* In Poen. 334, . . . *ut Venerem propitiem.* || *eho, an iratast? propitia herclest*, in Trin. 371, 637, and elsewhere, the speaker implies that the idea taken up in the *an*-question was mistaken. But in the great majority of the cases the question with *an* expresses no opinion, but only asks for confirmation and direct assertion of that which has been indirectly implied.

If now we hold to the common doctrine that *an* by its nature always expresses an alternative, it must be acknowledged that in many of these cases it is not difficult to supply a first member like "have I understood you rightly?" "is that the case or . . .?" Perhaps there is no case in which some form of first member could not be thought out which would at once suit the context and be an antithesis to the *an*-question. But, on the other hand, there is hardly a single one of these questions which naturally and easily suggests a complete disjunctive question; there is in most cases something forced and artificial in the ellipsis, and in some cases, e. g. Ps. 1161, 1172, Mil. 822, 840, Trin. 934, 942, 943, Eun. 733, the awkwardness and artificiality are very clear. The full force of this can be felt only by making an examination of all the cases in the foregoing list. From such an examination, which I have no space to give here in detail, it is clear to me, in the first place, that it would be equally easy to supply a first member for all the questions having *ne* appended to the verb, and, in the second place, that it would be easier to supply a second member to the *an*-questions than to supply a first member, if it were not for the feeling, which comes from the classical Latin, that *an* must necessarily mean "or." In other words, it is logic, not language, which requires the completion of every *an*-question, and the disjunctive question thus formed is simply the logically complete question into which any kind of sentence question may be expanded.

(*b*). The question with *an*, though not at the beginning of the speech, refers back to the words of the other speaker and the intervening sentence is parenthetic.

The interposed sentence may be a mere remark. Poen. 1194, *sicut nos . . . praestitimus pulcritudine. || stulta . . . es. an tu eo pulcra videre, opsecro, si . . . ?* So Capt. 680, Hec. 878, Trin. 954. Or a question may come between. Hec. 671, . . . *ego alam ? || quid dixti ?* *eho, an non alemus, Parmeno ?* So with *quid ais ?* Hec. 346, with some form of repetition Aul. 82, Ad. 661, Eun. 857, Hec. 209. Ps. 305 belongs in this general class, whether we read *credere autem ?* or with Bugge, Langen, p. 315, *aude*. In Trin. 954 ff. the question with *an* refers either to the preceding speech or to the interposed words, and, in general, the clause is not wholly parenthetic, but is rather a preparation for the *an*-question. This usage therefore forms a kind of connecting link between the preceding class (*a*) and those which follow.

Pl. 5, Ter. 6.

(c). The question with *an* refers to something which the speaker has himself said. Under this head fall all the remaining questions with *an*, both complete and incomplete, and in order to trace their connection with each other I have subdivided them according to the form of the preceding sentence.

(1). The preceding sentence is declarative. Amph. 1027, *paene ecfregisti . . . cardines. an foris censebas nobis publicitus praeberier?* Amph. 688, Asin. 528, Capt. 257, Men. 962, Most. 334 (the arrangement of speakers is not certain), 596, Poen. 265, St. 294, Truc. 88, And. 621, Hec. 215, Ph. 279 (the intervening speech is an aside), 1024. Pl. 10, Ter. 4.

These occur mostly in the midst of a long speech. They do not express an antithesis or an alternative to what precedes, but rather a possible interpretation of it which suddenly arises in the mind of the speaker and causes him to change his previous opinion, to look upon the matter from a new point of view. So in Men. 962, Menaechmus hardly knows whether he is in his senses or not, and is thinking over the reasons for hoping that he is sane, when suddenly a new explanation of the strange events occurs to him: *an illi, perperam insanire qui aiunt me, ipsi insaniunt?* The awkwardness of supplying a clause with *utrum* is even greater here than in the cases given above, though it is perhaps not possible to exclude the hypothesis of an ellipsis altogether.

(2). A *quis*-question precedes the sentence with *an*. Amph. 661, *quid ille revortitur . . . ? an ille me temptat sciens, . . . ?* Most. 7, *quid tibi . . . clamitatio?* *an ruri censes te esse?* Eun. 907, *quamobrem?* *an quia pudet?* Amph. 457, Asin. 524, Bacch. 676, Capt. 629, Cist. IV 1, 17, Men. 231, 496, 722, Most. 35, Ps. 92, Rud. III, And. 888, Eun. 1017, Heaut. 334, 543, Hec. 293, 356, 436, 784, Ph. 602. Without verb, Most. 489, St. 549, 552. In Rud. 1274 the speaker pays no attention to the meaningless answer *censeo*. Pl. 17, Ter. 10.

In all these cases the sequence of thought is the same. In the *quis*-question the speaker asks in the most general way about some preceding act; then his mind, reviewing all possible answers, suddenly settles upon one as most probable or most interesting, and he inquires about it in the *an*-sentence. So in Amph. 661 the ideas come up in this way: "He has returned. Why? Which of all possible reasons has caused his return? To try me! Is that it? Is he trying to find out how I bear his absence?" These questions therefore resemble those already given in expressing

the sudden turning of the mind to some new thought. It is possible to supply a first clause, but the sequence of thought indicated above, one of every-day occurrence, is complete enough in itself.

(3). A question with *num* precedes. The only cases are Poen. 1315, Ph. 412, and by conjecture Merc. 981; cf. Madvig, Opusc. Acad. II, p. 230 ff., Kühner, II, p. 1017. As Kühner holds that *num* always expects a negative answer, his remarks do not apply to Poen. 1315. The small number of cases is due to the fact that *num* frequently calls attention to an evident fact about which there could be no further question. Pl. 1 [2], Ter. 1.

(4). A question with *ne* or without a particle precedes the *an*-question. (The illustrations given here will be included in the full list at the end of this division.)

(i). In some cases the preceding question is subordinate and *an* refers back over it, as in the cases under *b*. Ad. 337, . . . *narremus quoipiam?* || *au, au, mi homo, sanun es? an hoc proferendum tibi videtur usquam?* So Aul. 424, Mil. 499.

(ii). In certain passages the question with *an* is, if reduced to its essential idea, nothing more than a repetition in different form of the preceding question. Asin. 504, *nequeon ego ted interdictis facere mansuetem meis? an ita tu's animata ut qui expers matris imperio sies?* These two questions amount to the same thing in the end, but the variation of phrase, the emphasis laid in the one case upon the mother's power, in the other upon the daughter's disposition, introduce a kind of adversative or disjunctive idea; cf. also Poen. 1315, Asin. 509, Eun. 47, 1013, Heaut. 505, Hec. 663, Ad. 782, Ph. 415, the last coming nearest to a complete disjunctive question.

COMPLETE DISJUNCTIVE QUESTIONS.

Although we pass at this point across the line which is commonly held to separate the complete disjunctive question from the so-called incomplete form with *an*, the distinction is so slight that the preceding classification is continued.

(iii). The question with *an* is almost a perfect antithesis to the previous question, but has a different verb.

Mil. 1424, *verberone etiam an iam mittis?* The perfect disjunctive would be *an non verbero?* and the question *an iam mittis?* is not the alternative, but the suggestion of a new third possibility which occurs to the slave as he speaks. As in Most.

7, *quid tibi . . . clamatist ? an ruri censes te esse ?* the question with *an* selects one of the possibilities of the *quid*-question, so here *an* selects for expression, not the perfect alternative, but merely a kind of second thought. So Ad. 336, Men. 319, Bacch. 1168, Curc. 589, Merc. 902. In Trin. 468 ff. the antithesis is almost perfect.

(iv). Even where the verb is the same for both clauses the disjunctive idea is sometimes only partially complete. Mil. 783, *ingenuamne an libertinam ?* does not include the possibility of a slave; cf. Mil. 965 and 966.

(v). The use of *an*—*an* must also be regarded as a survival of the independent *an*-question; cf. Draeg. I 347. Ps. 1247, *pedes, statim an non ? an id voltis, ut me hinc iacentem aliquis tollat ?* shows clearly how, after the complete alternative of the first sentence, a third possibility, explanatory of the *an non*, occurs to the speaker. Other cases are Amph. 690, Epid. 223, Eun. 386, 986, 1044 (*ne—an—an—an*). Cf. Aul. 730.

The illustrations thus far given show how indistinct is the line which separates the independent *an*-question, following another question, from what would properly be punctuated as a single disjunctive question. The next step is the perfect disjunctive with *an non*.

The passages in which *an* follows a question with *ne*, with *an*, or without a particle, whether punctuated as one sentence or as two, are as follows:

ne—an, Amph. 343, Asin. 504, 509, 687, Bacch. 31 (*anne*), Capt. 270, Cas. II 6, 53, Epid. 634, Men. 198, 319, Merc. 130, 150, 602, Mil. 499, 783, 961, 965, 1020, 1424, Ps. 610, Trin. 331, 332, 468 ff., Ad. 185, 336, 337, Eun. 1013, Heaut. 203, Hec. 663, Ph. 275, 415.
Pl. 23, Ter. 8.

(—) — *an*, Aul. 424, Bacch. 162, 1168, Capt. 334, Curc. 589, Merc. 902, Men. 915, Rud. 853, Trin. 349, Ad. 782, Eun. 47, Heaut. 505.
Pl. 9, Ter. 3.

ne—an non, Aul. 643, 660, Capt. 74, 846, Curc. 566, Epid. 538, Mil. 416, 449, Pers. 533, Ps. 254, 616, 1246, Rud. 1399, Trin. 1071, Truc. 4, 755, 825, And. 186, 201, Heaut. 405, Ph. 852.
Pl. 16, Ter. 4.

These have impv. force in 2d sing. pres. except Aul. 643 and Ps. 616. The rest are mostly *estne*.

(—) — *an non*, Mil. 787, Pers. 378, St. 264, Trin. 983, And. 762, Eun. 546, 968, Heaut. 595, Ph. 147.
Pl. 4, Ter. 5.

an — *an*, Amph. 690, Epid. 223, Ps. 1247, Eun. 386, 986, 1044 ff.
Pl. 3, Ter. 3.

The other forms of the complete disjunctive occur as follows:

ne — *necne*, Capt. 713.

utrum — *ne* — *an*, Bacch. 75, Men. 1119, Ps. 709, Rud. 104, St.
118, 703, Ad. 382, Eun. 721. Pl. 5, Ter. 2.

utrum — *an*, Amph. prol. 56 (cf. Mil. 787), Cas. II 4, 10, Cist.
247 Uss. (Frag. 23, Ben.) III 10, Pers. 341, Ps. 878, Rud. 780,
Trin. 175. Pl. 8.

On *anne* see Draeg. I 351, Kühn. II 1016.¹ It is found Bacch.
31, Cist. II 1, 42, Rud. 1140, 1275, Truc. 666, And. 851. Truc. 695
should be *iamne*. These are of course independent uses of *an*.

Pl. 3, Ter. 1.

In the following *an* has been added by conjecture: Cas. III 5,
53, Curc. 129, Poen. 1130, Rud. 233, St. 330, Truc. 135, 723.
Found in the MSS, but omitted for metrical reasons, Pers. 483, Ph.
737. Truc. 272 is somewhat doubtful, but has *an* in an independent
question. In Trin. 922 I have followed Speng. Bx. Ps. 124
is confused in the MSS, but *utrum oculum anne aurem?* (Bx.
Lor.) is probably correct.

This classification of *an* and disjunctive questions is not given
with the belief that it corresponds in detail to the order of devel-
opment, but it is meant to illustrate in a general way the fact that
the independent *an*-sentence preceded the complete disjunctive
question.

1. In language simplicity comes before complexity. The proofs
of this are multiplying in all fields of philology, and it is *a priori*
extremely improbable that the disjunctive question arose at once
in complete form. To reverse the order and derive the simple
question from the compound is to confuse language with logic.

2. While in classical Latin the complete disjunctive question is
more common (so, at least, Draeger appears to state) than *an*
alone, especially in the forms with *utrum*, in Pl. and Ter. the pro-
portion is reversed. In simple sentences *an* is used about 150
times, in compound sentences without *utrum* about 70 times, with
utrum 15 or 16 times. This proportion is explicable only on the
hypothesis that the *utrum* — *an* form was either a new type in

¹ Hinze regards *anne* as the original form. The connection with *av*, and
Gothic *an* is, I think, a fatal objection to this view. I take *an-ne* to be a
further illustration of the extension of *ne* to sentences where it was not strictly
necessary.

the time of Pl. and Ter. or was just dying out. Its later history contradicts the second alternative, since it can hardly be held that the dialogue nature of comedy, favorable as it is to ellipses, can account for a disproportion so great.

3. The difficulty of framing a first member to fill the supposed ellipsis has been already pointed out, and with any one who will make the actual test it will have great weight.

The history of the *an*-sentence I suppose to have been something like this: From its pronominal origin *an* must have derived a strong demonstrative force, whether it meant simply "that" or "the other, the second," and this demonstrative emphasis fitted it for use in questions which began with the sudden perception, either in the speaker's own mind or in the words of another, of some new and interesting suggestion. So *an* selects a single point in the stream of thought—"that! do you mean *that*?"—for emphatic comment or question. Therefore when *an* followed a *quis*-question it contrasted some single possibility with all the others, when it followed a question with *ne* it contrasted some second possibility with the first, and so passed from emphasis to antithesis and to alternation, and finally to the forms in which the verb would be the same in both members and to the perfect disjunctive with *an non*.

To the double question thus formed by mere juxtaposition, as the indirect question was formed out of the direct, and all hypotactic forms out of paratactic, *utrum* was prefixed as a clearer expression of the alternative; cf. the introductory *quid*? As Draeger remarks, I 346, *utrum* retains much of its original pronominal force, e. g. in Men. 1119, *uter eratis, tun an ille, maior?* Bacch. 75, *simulato me amare. || utrum ego istuc iocor adsimulem an serio?*

With the growth of logical habits of thought and expression the use of the complete disjunctive question became more general, and it is quite likely that the analogy of the independent *an*-sentence, which was never entirely suppressed, may have led to the use of *an*-questions, especially in rhetorical styles, e. g. in Cicero, with a partially felt ellipsis of a first member; cf. the statistics for Persius and Ovid given by Dr. Morris H. Morgan, *Class. Rev.*, Feb. 1889 (III 1), p. 10. Persius has 5 cases of complete disjunctive question, 2 in which the first member is "easily supplied" and 7 independent; Ovid has 35 complete, 24 with first member "omitted but easily supplied," 21 independent. Dr. Morgan has

kindly sent me the references for these, and the cases in which a first member is supplied from the context seem to me to be of a kind not found in Pl. and Ter. I should say the same of the rhetorical uses so fully studied in Seyffert's *Scholae Latinae*.

IMPERATIVE QUESTIONS.

Questions having something of the force of a command have been noted as they occurred in the foregoing lists. They are *abin*, *accipin*, *audin* when it refers to what is about to be said, *dan datin*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *in (isne)*, *iuben* with *infin.*, *manen*, *praeben*, *properatin*, *recedin*, *reddin* (text not sure), *viden ut* (not distinct), *daturne* (text improbable), *ibin* (text?), *eximesne* (MSS *eximes*), fut. ptc. with *esse* except Eun. 462, *etiamne* (five cases), *potin ut* or *potin* with subjunct., *ecquid agis*, *audis*, etc., *ecquis currit*, *aperit*, etc., *non taces*, *abis*, *respondes*, etc. (27 cases), *etiam taces*, *respondetis*, etc. (19 cases), possibly a few times with *iam*. In sentences without a particle having the verb late there is no impv. force, and there are no clear cases with the verb early (IV G.); *an* does not give impv. effect in any case, but in complete disjunctive questions with *an non* some of these forms recur, e. g. *abin an non*?

These fall into a few general classes, verbs with *ne*, *ecquis ecquid*, *non*, *potin ut*, *etiam(ne)*, and fut. ptcc., and it is at once apparent that these are so various as to exclude the hypothesis that the impv. effect is produced by any single word or single form of question. The only common element is the present tense (omitting the half dozen futures), and it seemed to me possible that the explanation might be found in a vaguely future use of the pres.; cf. *quid ago?* *eon?* and the 2d pers. fut. for the impv. in assertions. But upon this hypothesis the future itself should be frequently used with impv. force (cf. *quid ago?* with the much more frequent *quid agam?*), whereas it occurs only six or eight times. Also the 2d pers. fut. has impv. force because its use expresses a confident expectation, and this would correspond to the use of the 1st pers. in questions; cf. the uses of *iam*. It is easy to translate *abin?* "will you get out?" but the Engl. *will* simply confuses the precise sense of the Latin. I conclude, therefore, that the impv. questions cannot belong to the class of idioms which preserve a meaning originally inherent in a word or phrase, but must be explained as later deviations from the original and proper meanings of questions. In other words, they may be strictly called "questions

used instead of commands," and it remains only to discover, if possible, the psychological motives which led to the use of the interrogative sentence in imperative functions.

In the majority of cases, especially with *ne*, the impv. use lies close to the *ne* = *nonne* usage, that is, it results from the employment of a formal question where only one answer is possible. Thus *abin*, addressed as it usually is by a superior to an inferior, is a hint so strong as to amount to a command; *accipin*, in immediate connection with *tene* and *accipe*, is like Engl. "Are you going to take this?" So the other verbs, *audin*, *dan*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *præben* and the rest, all refer to some act which was plainly not being performed, and about which the speaker could not ask for information: "Are you running away? are you giving me water?" The circumstances supplied the answer, so that there could not be any real interrogation; only the urgency remained and gave a partial impv. effect.

In a few cases certainly, perhaps in most, there is also an ironical tone, produced or expressed by asking a very formal question where the answer is obvious. So with *potin ut*, which almost always has a verb of passivity depending upon it, *quiescas*, *molestus ne sis*, etc., like the Engl. "Will you be so kind as to attend to your own business?"

With *non taces?* *non abis?* *etiam tu taces?* about 50 cases in all, there is no formal questioning; the sentences are exclamatory, and the impv. effect, which is not very strong, is only a slight extension of the exclamation. *non taces?* means "You don't keep still! (I am surprised; I had supposed you would)." *etiam tu taces?* means "Quiet at last! (I expected you to keep still long ago)."

While these questions may properly be said to be used "instead of the impv." and may in some cases seem to be really equivalent to it, they nevertheless retain a close connection with their original use. Thus *abin an non?* || *abeo*; thus *dicisne* is answered once by *dicam*, once by *dico*, *fugin* by *ego vero ac lubens*, *viden* by *video*, *potin ut* by *potest*, *non taces* by *non taceo*. These show conclusively that a sense of the interrogation was still left, as indeed must have been the case as long as *audin*, *viden* and others could still be used in a pure interrogation. On *ecquis hic est?* and *ecquis aperit?* used side by side (an especially instructive case) see III, near the end. On the other hand, of the verbs given above with *ne* having impv. force, *abin*, *accipin*, *dan*, *dicisne*, *fugin*, *in*,

manen, miltin, praeben, properatin, recedin, reddin are never used without impv. force, in a pure interrogation. This is doubtless due partly to the meaning of the verbs, but it seems to me to indicate that, as they took on the impv. function, they tended to lose the interrogative function and to become fixed in the impv. sense. This is most distinct in *abin*, which became formulaic in curses.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE.

The early history of the Latin interrogative sentence must of necessity rest largely upon inference, and the following sketch is not supposed to be a final statement, but is intended as a working hypothesis to be filled out at some future time.

It is a mistake to measure the interrogative sentence by the standard of the declarative. The earliest sentence was neither declarative, nor imperative, nor exclamatory, nor interrogative, but contained in itself the possibilities of all these, and could be all of them by turns. It had no normal order and no normal voice-inflection, but the earliest step toward differentiation must have been the association of certain successions of words and certain inflections with special meanings. So a sentence with the verb at the end and with unemotional inflection became associated with the simple declaration, and in the same way arose several forms of sentence varying in meaning from the exclamation to the comparatively unemotional question: *First*, a sentence like the declarative, but with emotional, perhaps rising, inflection, in which the voice expressed sufficiently the very slight interrogative-exclamatory character. *Second*, sentences in which some form of the pronoun stood first. These were considerably varied and included or were the source of many later forms of the interrogative sentence. Perhaps the most distinct were those in which the pronoun was the subject and had not begun to change at all into an adverb or particle. So *hic, ille, iste* and the personal pronouns *ego, tu*, which not only stood at the beginning, but by the very fact that they were expressed at all aided the exclamatory-interrogative character of the sentence. With these was used a sentence in which the indefinite (originally demonstrative) *quis* stood at the beginning.¹ Further, there were sentences in which words of pronominal stem

¹ It is of course possible to suppose that the interrogative function was developed in this word before the indefinite, but see Kvičala, *Unters. auf dem Gebiete der Pron.*, p. 6 ff.; Paul, *Princ.*² p. 109.

in the acc. or loc., perhaps already turned into adverbs, stood at the beginning. Among these (for some may have been lost) were *an*, a word of such strong demonstrative force that it had a contrasting effect, and *num* or *nunc*, of the same stem as *nam*. Third, the verb itself took the first place in the sentence under the influence of strongly marked interrogative inflection; this strong emphasis upon the most important word of the sentence doubtless marked the widest departure from the declarative and the nearest approach to the simple question.

Some of these forms, perhaps all, must have been very early. The last, with the verb at the beginning, appears in German, and, I am told, in Gothic also, but I have been unable to find out whether the Sanskrit has any such interrogative form, and must in any case leave to comparative philologists the question whether this was an original I. E. form of sentence. I should conjecture that it was.

At this stage there was no special form of question for the *nonne* sense, but as this sense is really very close to the neutral question it was expressed by the question with the verb early, e. g. *sum verus?* Cf. also the uses of *ecquid* above. Even for questions expecting a negative answer, though *num* was used early, the differentiation was so incomplete that this sense could be expressed by sentences which had the verb at the beginning (*credis*) or by *ecquid*.

From this second stage in the development of the interrogative sentence arose three particles, that is, of the words upon which the interrogative emphasis rested, three lost in large measure their proper meaning, and, by constant association with questions, seemed to be and therefore became mere signs of the interrogation, though retaining traces of their original use. Of these the most important was *an*, which, if not the earliest, was certainly very early, and was entirely independent in its development, that is, was not made interrogative by association with any other word, but by the fact of its having stood as a strong demonstrative at the head of the sentence. I cannot see that it makes any difference whether we say that the stem meant "that" or "the other, the second," since the latter meaning is nothing but a development of the strong contrasting demonstrative idea. The use of *an* in corrective and adversative questions and its later disjunctive force have already been discussed in detail.

The second particle which must be referred to this early stage

is *num.* While acknowledging freely the obscurity which surrounds the origin and proper meaning of this word, I consider the connection with *nunc* more probable than that with *ne*, and suppose that the challenging use (cf. St. 297, *nunc ultro id deportem?*) was the earlier, from which the neutral sense came by further loss of meaning. The later prevailing sense, expecting a negative answer, would then come from the challenging use, and the use in indirect questions would be descended from the neutral sense.

A third interrogative word, whose origin was apparently early, was *ec-* or *en*, associated always with the indefinites *quis* and *unquam*. Whatever may have been its original form, it was so largely used by Pl. that it can hardly have been a new word in his time, but it was a neutral word and came into competition with *ne*, so that even in Ter. its use had greatly decreased.

A third and very important step in the history of the interrogative sentence was the development of the particle *-nē*. From the locative *na-i* came three forms, *ne*, *nei*, *ni*, all containing already the negative idea, which came from the strong demonstrative idea ("that, not this"). For the negative see, among others, Ritschl, Opusc. II 622 ff., Ribbeck, Partik., 16 ff. While *ni* branched off with (negative) conditional sentences, *nē* became the earliest and most widely used negative, appearing in classical Latin in the conjunction, in *non*, etc. It did not originate a distinct form of question, but was introduced into a question already formed, the question in which the verb stood at the beginning. This was the most neutral kind of question, and every neutral question suggests a negation, is by its nature a wavering between affirmation and negation. Warren is wrong in the irony with which he says of Hand that he intrenches himself "behind the profound philosophical observation that every question implies doubt, and that all doubt borders upon negation, and that hence every question contains a negative element," p. 72; cf. Hand IV 71. No doubt Hand goes much too far in supposing that the negative was always felt in *-nē*, but the correctness of the general view that the interrogation and the negation are closely allied, psychologically, is placed beyond a doubt by Imme, II, p. 6 ff., and clearly recognized by Paul, p. 110. This negative element was more and more clearly felt, as the interrogative sentence swung away from the exclamation, until in the balanced, neutral question, with the verb at the beginning, it found expression in the negative word *ne*. Psychologically considered, such a question as *estne frater intus?* was almost the same thing as the later *est frater intus an non?*

Having thus found a place in the neutral question, *ne* lost by the law of association its proper negative force and became a neutral interrogative particle. It was thus fitted for a wider use as the sign of a question than *an* or *num*, and extended its sphere from the sentence which began with a verb to all forms of question which had not already some mark of interrogation, even to those in which the interrogative tone was very slight. In this way are to be explained the various kinds of exclamatory sentence with *ne*, *tun is eras?* *nuncin demum?* *egon dicam?* *itan contemnor?* *eine ego ut advorser?* and the exclamatory infinitives *haecine te esse oblitum?* *mene efferre?* etc. This is also the reason why no certain line can be drawn between, e. g. *audisti* and *audistin*, between *est* and *estne*, *etiam* and *etiamne*. All these forms of sentence continued to exist alongside of the more distinct interrogation, and it was optional with the speaker in the time of Pl. to use the older form or to heighten somewhat the questioning tone of an exclamatory sentence by the use of *ne*. Yet this encroachment of the interrogation upon the exclamation was not unchecked, since of the 900 questions without a particle about nine-tenths are exclamatory. Finally, after *ne* became thoroughly neutralized, there was a further development of idioms out of the pure question, such as some of the uses of *ain*, *audin*, *viden*, *vin*, and especially the imperative questions, *abin*, *fugin*, etc.

The process by which *ne* became an interrogative particle is therefore essentially different from that which produced *an* and *num*. These were independent pronominal words which the interrogative-exclamatory inflection held at the beginning of the sentence, and which became interrogative when the sentence did; *ne* was introduced into an interrogative sentence that was already fully developed, as a fuller and, one might almost say, deliberate expression of the interrogation.

I am acquainted with only two sketches of the early history of *ne*. The first is by Probst, *Beiträge zur Lateinischen Grammatik*, II, pp. 135-6, given as an illustration of his general view that conjunctions get their meaning by association. After speaking of the forms *ne*, *nei*, *ni*, he says, "Wir verfolgen hier nur die Form 'ne' weiter. Diesem 'ne' assoziierte sich der Gedankeninhalt der Fragen, in denen es vorzugsweise verwendet wurde, d. h. es hatte bald *positiven*, bald *negativen* Sinn (Kühner, II, p. 1002). Beide Bedeutungen kamen dann auch offenbar durch Vermittlung der rhetorischen Fragen (d. s. Aussagen) in der *Aussage* zur Geltung.

So ergaben sich von einem einheitlichen Stamme zwei der Bedeutung nach verschiedene 'ne,' die der Herkunft nach jedoch nicht von einander zu trennen sind (vgl. Deecke in Bursian's Jahresberichten XXVIII 226 [should be 216]). Das *positive* 'ne' (nae) tritt noch z. B. in Verbindung mit 'edepol' u. ähnl. auf; aber auch in dem Sinne von 'etiam, nempe, enim' (Priscian II 101) oder von 'ergo' (Serv. zur Aen.), vgl. Minton Warren in American Journal of Philology II 5, 32, s. 8, 1881 [II 5, pp. 50 ff.], findet es sich. Das *negative* 'ne' zeigt sich z. B. in 'neque, nec, non (ne-oenum), neve' u. s. f. als einfache Negation oder negative Konjunktion." Taken in connection with the whole drift of the argument I suppose this to mean that *ne, nei, ni* was originally neutral, that *ne* got both negative and affirmative meanings in and through its use in questions, that both meanings passed from questions into declarative uses, and that *nē* the negative and conjunction is thus descended from *nē* the interrogative particle. Not to dwell upon some obvious difficulties—e. g., it does not account for the negative sense of *ni*—the theory is sufficiently condemned by the fact that it leaves the Latin language without any negative at all until after the interrogative sentence was fully developed. The fact, of course, is that the negative sense of *nē* arose long before the time when language began to be written down.¹

The position taken by Professor Warren in the article referred to above is, on the other hand, perfectly clear, though it is merely suggested in the course of a paper devoted to other uses than the interrogative. He starts with the *egone si, hicine si* sentences, in which *ne* is apparently not interrogative. In this *ne* he sees the remnant of a supposed *nem*, an affirmative particle parallel to *nam* from the stem *na*, which passed over from declarative to interrogative sentences, especially exclamatory sentences like *egone ut, men* with the infin., etc. It did not come within the scope of Professor Warren's paper to fix precisely the limits of this use—"the interrogative use of the affirmative *nē*"—but the only form of question in which he clearly recognizes the negative *nē* is where *ne* seems to have the force of *nonne*. This theory has been accepted

¹ The third part of this essay (Leipzig, 1888) contains various remarks upon the interrogative sentence which I have not thought it worth while to refer to in detail. The history of *an*, pp. 238 ff., deserves mention for the confidence with which the author asserts that *an* was originally neutral in sense and was driven into a negative function (which it nowhere has) by the competition of *ne* and *nonne* (the latter of which did not come into existence till after the functions of *an* were fixed).

in whole by Dahl, VT, p. 299, and as to the non-interrogative sentences by Ribbeck on Mil. Glor. 309, Brix on the same (310) and doubtless by others.¹

I have tried to show above that the "*ne* = *nonne*" questions do not constitute a special class marked off by definite lines from other *ne*-questions; they indicate merely a use to which the neutral question was put, one of the idiomatic offshoots of the *ne*-question, like the impv. question. So *audin* "don't you hear?" *audin* "do you hear?" and *audin* "do you hear!" (impv.) are really one and the same phrase. If this is correct, then *nē* is no more negative in one *audin* than in the others; all contain the *ne* of negative origin, and the "*ne* = *nonne*" questions take their place with other idiomatic offshoots of the neutral question, from which they differ only by the fact that this sense is not strictly confined to *ne*-questions, and must therefore in part antedate the use of *ne*. My reasons for thinking that the *-nē* used in exclamations, *tun is eras?* *nuncin demum?* *men efferre . . . ?* and the rest, is simply an extension of the interrogative use to partially interrogative sentences have been already given. In regard to all these forms of sentence Professor Warren seems to me to be following the scholiasts and grammarians too far. Their strength lies in statements of fact; in explanations they are weak. The statement of a grammarian that in a certain sentence he felt a shade of meaning which he expressed by *ergo* is to be received with respect; his explanation of this meaning as due to *ne* I look upon as a very natural error, especially if the same meaning appears in other sentences without *ne*. All the shades of meaning which Professor Warren illustrates by the *ne* : *ergo*, *ne* : *vero* glosses I should attribute to the order, the mood, the voice-inflection, more than to the single word *ne*; in short, this appears to me to be a case in which the sentence has influenced the meaning of the particle far more than the particle has influenced the sentence.

The question whether *ne* first entered the interrogative sentence through the "*ne* = *nonne*" question or through the neutral question

¹ Brix suggests another explanation, viz., that *-nē* in non-interrogative sentences may come from the affirmative *nē*, shortened and made enclitic. I venture to suggest a third hypothesis: as *nē* by association with neutral questions lost its negative force and became interrogative, so *-nē* by being used with an emphatic pronoun in exclamations was still further weakened into a particle of exclamatory emphasis, and could be used with *hicine*, *egone*, *tunc* in sentences no longer interrogative. The word "affirmative" does not quite express the idea.

is less important, since it must in either case have been extended at once to all sentences with the verb at the beginning. But if it began in the neutral question, it is easy to see how it lost its negative force, while in a question with the effect of *nonne* it would tend strongly to retain a distinct negative force. Further, a true *nonne*-question is a negative sentence turned into a question; it has a corresponding negative declarative sentence, *non audio, non dixi*. But *dixin* is a question into which a negative has entered, and corresponds to *dixi*, not to *non dixi*. The position, also, of *ne* after the verb seems to distinguish these sentences from the earliest form of the negative question, in which *non* comes at the beginning and the verb at the end.

The fourth step in the history of questions resulted in several minor forms of sentence, and in one which afterward had wide use. This was the *non, nonne* question. It has already been shown that the distinction between the negative exclamation and the negative question corresponds to a difference in the position of *non*, and that the question has *non* at the beginning and the verb at the end. As *non* retained its independence and its negative meaning, *ne* could not be used with it until *ne* had itself lost its negative sense. For this reason, as well as because the *non*-question was itself of late origin, *nonne* was just beginning in the time of Pl. and is infrequent in Ter. Later, when the logical forms of the literary language crushed out the free natural growths, *nonne* played a great part in the interrogative sentence.

Imme points out (II, pp. 21, 26) the considerable influence which words of precision (Fragewörter der Bestimmtheit) have upon questions. German examples are *jetzt, immer, noch, je*; the most evident case in Latin is *num*, but to this class I should assign *etiam*, especially with imperative force, and the few cases of *iam* mentioned above. Like the German *wirklich*, English *really, actually*, are the cases of *ilane* in which *ila* has lost its standard of comparison; *satin* is even clearer, and is an excellent illustration on a small scale of the making of an interrogative particle. Of course these are not like *an*, since the interrogative force lay from the beginning in *ne*, but the gradual change of meaning from "enough" to "really, actually" shows that in sentences like *satin abiit?* *satin* was no longer felt as a compound, but had become little more than a particle.

In all these cases the same linguistic impulse is still at work that produced *an* and *num*; but in the time of Pl. this impulse

spent its force, and from this time on no new particles were brought into use.

While the question had thus been developing various forms to express various shades of meaning, the exclamatory sentence had at no time ceased to be used, though it had, perhaps owing to its kinship with the declarative sentence, been less prolific in evolving special forms. We might perhaps regard some of the interjections as signs of the exclamation, and certainly *nempe*, *fortasse*, *videlicet*, *credo* performed at times the function of indicating a hesitating assertion. The sentence with *cesso* also maintained itself as an idiom without *ne*; possibly it is raised into unnatural prominence, as *videon* certainly is, by the recurrence of a particular dramatic situation. The examples of the exclamation will be found mostly under IV.

As the exclamation is akin to the repetition, it often suggests rejection or repudiation. In this way the pronominal questions under I. B, either with or without *ne*, retain much of the exclamatory force, because they take up for question some single idea already suggested. They pass over the main idea as correct, and settle down with all the force of contrast upon one thing, questioning that alone with a severity which suggests a doubt of its correctness.

All the forms of question thus far enumerated grew out of the exclamatory-declarative sentence; from the sentence of will there came a similar but much less extended development. The mark of this kind of sentence, so far as questions are concerned, is the subjunctive.

The deliberative question, addressed by the speaker to himself, corresponds to the indicative question with the verb at the beginning, and like that may have *ne*; it is a simple question in regard to the speaker's intention or ability, and the subjunctive retains so much of its future force as to be in single cases indistinguishable from a future.

A sentence which expresses a wish, an exhortation, a command, that is, the will of another person, is not in itself questioning, but exclamatory. I have already shown that the forms in the 1st pers., which are the only ones at all noteworthy, follow all but invariably an impv. or some other expression of willing, and are closely allied to repetitions. In fact *dic. || dicam?* is simply an exclamatory repetition with the necessary change of person, and, except for the mood, exactly like *dixisti. || dixi?* That is, the

repudiation is due to the exclamatory repetition; all that the mood does is to direct the repudiation upon the will. The simplest form, e. g., *abi. || abeam ?* is found, but this is more frequently, and with *ne* invariably, used for deliberative questions. In repudiation it is almost instinctive to add an interrogative or a pronoun or both, as in English, though it is possible to express this idea in a single word with peculiar circumflex accent ("speak! || spêak?"), it is more natural to add some further words. All the interrogatives may be used, as with the indic. Compare Aul. 652, *certe habes. || habeo ego ? quid habeo ?* with Bacch. 406, *sequere. || quo sequar ?* Bacch. 630, *habe bonum animum. || unde habeam ?* Eun. 610, *muta vestem. || ubi mutem ?* There is no real difference between *quo, ubi, unde* in these sentences, and *ut* in Amph. 694, *te ut deludam contra . . . ?* But the form with *ut* alone is not frequent; generally the pronoun is added to *dicam* or *ut dicam*, either alone or with *ne*. Cf. *egon* with the indic. And as in English these sentences are expressed by a circumflex accent upon both words, so in Latin the ordinary position of *egon* before *ut* shows that it was not fully incorporated into the sentence. When *ne* is used with these forms of exclamation, it expresses the nearest approach to a real question. For an unemotional questioning of the will of another person, a leading verb in the indic. must be introduced. So Aul. 634, *redde huc sis. || quid tibi vis reddam ?* Most. 578, *gere modum . . . || quid tibi ego vis geram ?* are to be regarded as extensions of *quid reddam, geram ?* in the direction of unemotional questioning.

What is remarkable, therefore, in these much discussed questions ("die unwilligen oder missbilligenden Fragen") is the convergence upon them of two lines of influence, the mood, by which they express will, and the exclamatory repetition, which makes them repudiating.¹

While it is plain that *ut* is interrogative in these questions and similar to *quid, unde, ubi*, there is in questions with *utine* the difficulty that this involves the use of *-ne* with an interrogative. This anomaly is rare and late, occurring only once (Trin. 1095) in Pl., and not at all in Ter. If the *utine* questions are put by the side

¹Kraz, die sog. unwillige oder misbilligende Frage, Stuttgart, 1862; Müller, same title, Görlitz, 1875; cf. Schnoor, zum Gebrauch von *ut* bei Pl., Neumünster, 1885, p. 3. A discussion of the mood in these questions would be profitless until the subjunctive in declarative sentences in Pl. and Ter. has been more thoroughly studied.

of *quaene*, *quodne*, *quiane* and other relatives, it will be seen that the kinship is hardly less close than that with *ut*, both in form (except for the mood) and in repudiating effect. The explanation I take to be this: The change from parataxis to hypotaxis is the result, not so much of the putting together of two complete sentences, as of the prefixing of an introductory verb to the clause which thus became subordinate. Thus *ne id accidat* was the original portion, and *timeo* was a prefixed introduction, an expression of the total intention of the clause; so *quid negoti est (sit)?* was an exclamatory repetition to which *rogas* was prefixed. This leading verb, the expression of a greater precision, struggled slowly up from unconsciousness to consciousness and expression, and there must have been a time with every construction which passed from parataxis to hypotaxis, when the idea of the leading verb was partially felt and could be expressed or omitted. Many illustrations of this may be found in Pl. and Ter., e. g., with *ain*, *audin*, *rogas*, and cf. *vis reddam*, above. At this point stood the *ut* questions, descended evidently and immediately from *ut* interrogative, but with a faint consciousness that greater precision required an introductory verb, and therefore just on the point of changing from *ut* interrogative to *ut* relative. This is the reason why these clauses with *utine* so closely resemble *quodne*, *quiane*, *quamne*, and also the reason why Pl., to whom *ne* after an interrogative was strange, could use *ne* with *ut*. Only half the truth is expressed by classing *utine* questions with relatives, as I have done, or by calling *ut* the Interrogativum-rhetoricum (Probst, p. 150); it partakes of the nature of both.

The differences between Pl. and Ter are not as great as might be expected. The slighter differences, such as may often be found between two authors of the same period, have been noted as they came up, e. g., the greater frequency in Ter. of the 1st pers. pres. except *sum*, of *ain?* *pergin*, *itane*, etc. Two points only deserve special mention. In the first place, Ter. uses the exclamatory forms more frequently than Pl. So of repetitions of all kinds, including *rogas*, *rogilas*, he has almost as many cases in six plays as Pl. has in twenty, showing especial fondness for single verbs like *tenes?* *nostin?* etc., as well as for the infin. In the second place, Ter. employs with *ne* a much greater variety of questions than Pl., e. g., a greater number of verbs in the 1st pers. pres., more verbs in unusual tenses, a much greater variety of adjectives and nouns, more pronouns in other cases than the nominative.

These two tendencies indicate a widening distance between the exclamation and the question, which had been originally one. The exclamatory effect was going out of the question, and therefore Ter. used distinctively exclamatory forms where Pl. would have felt a sufficient exclamatory force in the question. And, on the other hand, the question was becoming stereotyped, and the questioning force seemed more and more to reside in the particles, especially in *ne*, so that the particle could carry interrogative effect into any form of sentence. The reign of the particle was beginning. This I suppose to be the ordinary course of evolution; the tendencies to variation become fixed in species, and the intermediate forms, the connecting links, drop out of existence.

QUESTIONS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR FUNCTIONS.

The principle seems to be generally adopted in our manuals of Latin grammar that language is best presented to the student from the psychological side. Therefore we have conditional clauses, final clauses, even concessive clauses, rather than *si* clauses, *ut* clauses, *qui* clauses. Carrying this idea over into interrogative sentences, it has been the custom to divide them into questions for information, questions expecting a negative answer, and questions expecting an affirmative answer. This three-fold division has doubtless had some support from its general coincidence with the particles *ne*, *num*, and *nonne*, and it has also, unfortunately, reacted upon our conception of the meaning and uses of these particles, narrowing them too strictly within logical limits.

As a partial corrective of this too mechanical classification I have thought it worth while to call attention to the two excellent programs by Th. Imme, *Die Fragesätze nach psychologischen Gesichtspunkten eingeteilt und erläutert*, Cap. I-III, Cleve, 1879, Cap. IV-VI, 1881. In the first is given a general study of the interrogation with a discussion of the pronominal questions (*Bestimmungsfragen*). In the second the author classifies the varieties of sentence-question (*Bestätigungsfragen*), using for illustration mainly German, Greek and English examples. I give here a brief outline of the second program with illustrations from Pl. and Ter.¹

¹ Aside from their special object these programs are worth reading as illustrating the definite and valuable results which may be obtained from the combination of psychology and philology.

Questions differ according to the proportions in which they contain two distinct lines of thought. In the first place, when the mind conceives an idea imperfectly or dimly, or when an idea once clearly grasped is rendered uncertain by the presentation to the mind of a new idea inconsistent with the first, then the effort to attain to clearness and certainty takes the form of a question, especially if there be another person present. In the second place, there may co-exist in the mind at the same time with the uncertainty a somewhat distinct opinion in regard to the matter which is the subject of the question. According to the proportions in which these two elements are present Imme makes five grades of sentence-question.

1. Questions of awakened interest (or der aufstrebenden Erkenntniss), in which only the first element is present. These are the pure questions, questions for information, in regard to matters about which the speaker could not have any opinion. They are very rare in 1st pers., and not frequent in 2d pers. All forms of *stipulatio*, *habeon rem pactam ? sponden, dabin*, come in this class, and such forms as *ain, audin, viden, scin, vin*, with direct object; also *cognoscin, esne, haben, ludin, valen*. Almost all 3d persons are of this kind, *est(ne) frater domi ?* either with or without *ne*, and most cases of nouns, adjectives and adverbs with *ne*. So also many cases of *num, numquis adest ? numquid de Dacis audisti ?* (Hor.) and some few cases of *an* approach this sense.

2. Questions of doubt (Zweifelfragen) are not the dubitative or deliberative questions with the subjunctive, but questions where the speaker's previous opinion has been shaken by some sudden thought, so that he is thrown from certainty into doubt. Cases in which no trace of the previous opinion appears are infrequent; generally it shows itself in a leaning in one direction or the other, and according as the previous opinion was negative or affirmative, the question will lean toward the affirmative or the negative. From this result the two kinds of doubt-questions, those which expect an affirmative and those which expect a negative answer, or, as Imme calls them, yes-questions and no-questions. Examples of yes-questions, which should regularly contain a negative word, are cases of *non* at the beginning of the sentence with the verb at the end, *nonne, ne* with the effect of *nonne*, and the few cases without a particle which have *nonne* force. Imme's distinction between *non* and *nonne* is incorrect for Pl. and Ter. These are

all rather clearly marked, because the previous opinion, being negative, was distinguished by some clearly negative word. But there is no single word to express affirmation, and no-questions are therefore expressed in a great variety of ways. Words which express actuality or existence may mark a strong affirmation, and therefore in a question may indicate a leaning toward negation. Such are *itane vero*, *satin* in some meanings, verbs of thinking and believing like *credin*, *censen*, words expressing a moral or aesthetic standard like *sanun*, *duasne uxores habet*, *rufamne illam virginem* (Heaut. 1061), etc. Words of restriction or definition are still more frequent; *num*, *iam* and *etiam* in some cases, perhaps *adeon* and other demonstrative words, though these pass over into more distinct rejection. Even the circumstances, without the help of any one word, may so restrict the possible answers as to leave only a negative answer open, e. g. *repeton quem dedi?* Out of all these ways of expressing doubt of an affirmative opinion only *num* clearly assumed the function of an interrogative particle, though *etiam* came very near doing so.

3. Questions of certainty. In these the second element, the opinion previously held, becomes still more prominent, and only so much of the question is left as expresses a wish for assent from the person addressed. Special forms of this are questions with *nempe*, *videlicet*, *fortasse*, *credo*, and other illustrations may be found among questions without a particle having the verb at the end (IV. H.) Imme compares οὐκοῦν. When the assent is doubtful, this kind of question may be highly emotional, and many kinds of exclamation and repetition lie in the borderland between this class and the next, and may be used in either way.

4. Questions of repudiation or rejection, in which the previous opinion is so strong that the question is asked only to be at once repudiated or rejected. Here belong most forms of question with demonstrative or personal pronouns, many cases with *an*, and many repetitions, exclamations and supplementary questions. For the most part the questioning effect is so slightly felt that *ne* is not used with them.

Imme makes also a separate division for pedagogic questions, but with these Plautus was happily unacquainted.

5. Rhetorical questions. In these the question has sunk away to a mere form; in the mind of the speaker there is no question, nor does he suppose that there will be any question in the mind of the hearer, but he uses the question form only to express with

greater vividness the thought which instantly rises, as an answer, in the mind of the hearer. The only rhetorical questions at all frequent in the comedy are the imperative questions and the closely allied uses of *scin*, *viden*, *vin* as introductions to the main thought. Imme seems to me to go much too far in attempting to draw sharp distinctions between rhetorical questions and questions used rhetorically.

The rhetorical question should be distinguished as to origin from the emotional or exclamatory question; the exclamation is one of the oldest varieties of question, in a sense the source of all other forms, while the rhetorical question is a late offshoot from the fully developed question through degeneration and loss of meaning.

This outline of Imme's program may serve to illustrate the difficulties of a classification of questions according to function. All such classification introduces the delicate problem of determining just how much of its original sense may be still felt in a phrase which has been long in use. At the same time it shows the great variety of uses to which a single form of question may be put, and the large extension of usage which has taken place in regard to some kinds of interrogative sentence. The question having the verb with *ne*, for example, is found in all five classes, and even in both subdivisions of doubt-questions, and of the forms in general use in the time of Plautus hardly one is confined to a single function. Especially in no-questions the great variety of shadings in interrogative sentences is well illustrated (Imme treats this at great length), and the extreme difficulty of fixing the meaning of the sentence upon a single word is very apparent.

E. P. MORRIS.

III.—ΣΧΗΜΑ ΠΙΝΔΑΡΙΚΟΝ.

The present investigation is thought to be necessary, owing to the unscientific treatment which the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν has received in many grammars and editions. The name has been used as a convenient label for more than 50 passages—examples of concord, regular and irregular, of various kinds. Whether it be a case of an old plural form of a verb mistaken for a singular, or an impersonal verb or singular copulative verb joined with a plural complement, or a change of construction to a simpler form, we get grammars old and new, and editions up to the last four years, using the name σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν as if it were an explanation, and quoting as parallels cases that have been long cleared up or cases that show a totally distinct nature. In the following lists, for completeness, I have brought forward many passages which have been already properly explained, as well as many which have not, because scholars such as Sandys, Tyrrell, Campbell and Abbott have helped in recent years to perpetuate unscientific explanations. For example, the following bald comment is what is usually found in editions both German and English (from a recent Germ. edition of Aeschines in Ctesiph. §185): 'σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν: das Verbum geht in den meisten Fällen dem Subjekt voran.' This dictum will be seen to apply to no more than one-quarter of the examples usually grouped under this head. Again, the name should be given up when it is seen that *very* few of the examples cited are to be found in Pindar, and the passages cited from Pindar are found to be of very diverse character, admitting various explanations. But it is still more important that the phrases 'this idiom,' 'this syntactical figure,' should be no longer applied without discrimination to the various passages.

A convenient division of the passages treated is this: I. Those in which points of accident have to be considered; and II. Those which turn on points of syntax.

I. The first set of examples which have long been quoted by grammars as containing a singular verb with a plural subject shows us what is nothing but an old plural verb-form—ἦν; v.

Hesiod, Theog. 321, 825, 146; Simonides 165 [225]; Inscription of 475 B. C. on a Hermes, in Aeschines in Ctesiph. 185; Sophocles, Trach. 520; Eur. Ion 1146; Epicharmus 82, 52 (Ahrens 28) in Athenaeus VII 288b, Epicharmus 30, 31, 38, 49 in Athenaeus 307c; and Aristoph. Lysistr. 1260—a total of 13 examples, of which the last 7 are distinctly Doric Greek.

When Ahrens had shown in 1843 (II 326) that $\eta\nu$ in some of the above examples was a 3d plural form, we should not have expected to find these passages quoted as often as they have been in support of supposed cases of the σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν to be considered later. $\eta\nu$ is the natural contraction of the original Greek form $\eta\alpha\nu$ (Meyer) or $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ (Morph. Unters. IV, p. 293) from the I. E. e-s- η t, corresponding to the Skr. \acute{a} san, Boeotian $\pi\alpha\rho\text{-}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. The revived form $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ does not occur in Hesiod (for Op. 111 is rejected on other grounds), Pindar and Theocritus; hence the only two examples of it in Homer are due to late rewriting of the lines Il. 3, 15 and Od. 1, 27. The rareness of $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ (twice in Il., once in Od.) also leads us to conclude that the popular repetition of Homer, and to some extent of other poets, has weeded out the instances of $\eta\nu$ for the 3d pers. plur. Possibly such a correction has taken place in such passages of Homer and Hesiod as Hes. Scut. Her. 246, where $\eta\nu$ suits as well as $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$.

In Hes. Theog. 146, an example hitherto unnoticed, we get rid of the difficulty of the F by reading $\eta\nu$ ἐπὶ $F\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ instead of $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ ἐπ' $\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$, if the line be old.

In Soph. Trachin. 520 the simplest explanation is that Sophocles was consciously using an archaic or Doric form, perhaps partly for artistic reasons, for $\eta\nu$ is twice used before and once afterwards at the beginning of each clause.

In Eur. Ion 1146, ἐνῆν δ' ὑφάνται γράμμασιν τοιαῖδ' ὑφαί, we are compelled either to believe that Eur. like Sophocles chose to use what he knew to be an old plural form (for we cannot suppose him to have been ignorant of the use of $\eta\nu$ in Doric or in Hesiod) or resort to the explanation that a first thought such as ἐνῆν δ' ὑφάντα γράμματα was changed and amplified, and that ἐνῆν was kept for metrical reasons.

In Lucian, Amores, p. 410, $\eta\nu$ δ' ὑπὸ ταῖς ἄγαν παλινσκόις ὑλαῖς ἱλαραὶ κλίσεις τοῖς ἀνεστιάσθαι θέλουσιν, εἰς ἃ τῶν μὲν ἀστικῶν σπανίως ἐπεφοίτων τινές, not much doubt has been cast on the reading $\eta\nu$; all MSS have δ ; the margin of one has \acute{a} s. Unless this be considered a conscious imitation of previous authors on the part of either Lucian or his

copyist, each of which hypotheses is difficult to believe, it must be a mere slip. In the former case such passages as those mentioned above, Hes. Theog. 321, 825, Soph. Trach. 520, would be the authorities for the usage of singular verb with a following plural noun. It seems impossible to look on $\eta\nu = \etaσαν$ as a survival in popular speech through the κοινή times.

Analogous to the above in one respect are the foll. passages: Eur. Hipp. 1255: αἰαί· κέκρανται συμφοραὶ νέων κακῶν. Pind. Pyth. 9, 33 [57]: φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες. Xen. R. Equ. 5, 5: κέκλινται τρίχες. Dem. 22, §66 and 24, §173 (p. 754): πολλῶν ῥητόρων οἱ παρὰ τούτοις κέκρυνται. In the first two passages emendations have been usually adopted in the face of complete agreement of the MSS. But is it not satisfactory to suppose that like the early grammarians and copyists, who have not varied the text in these cases, the authors used κέκρανται and κεχείμανται as third plural forms on the analogy of λέλυνται, μέμνηνται, etc.? It is probable that there were many such usages in early colloquial Greek. Another wrongly supposed singular verb-form is seen in (Hom.) Hymns, Ceres 280, ξανθαὶ δὲ κόμαι κατενήνοθεν ὦμους, where no doubt the writer took the form as a plural from a similarity to such forms as ἀνεθεν διέκριθεν ἀπέσσυθεν; though an examination of the passages where ἐπενήνοθεν and κατενήνοθεν are used in Homer and Hesiod shows that none of them could be misread as having -ενήνοθεν as a plural form.

Aeschylus, Persae 49, is a case for restoration of original reading: στεῦται δ' ἱεροῦ Τρώλου πελάται | ζύγον ἀμφιβαλεῖν δούλιον Ἑλλάδι. Here στεῦνται was the original—most MSS give it—and the copyists, like the Schol., who calls it an example of the σχ. Πινδ., changed it to στεῦται, knowing that only that 3d pers. sing. form is found in Homer. But such an extension of Homeric usage is perfectly natural to all post-Homeric writers. Paley says, 'in this case, as the metre equally admits στεῦνται, the singular could not have proceeded from an emendator.' Surely no emendation is more to be expected from pedantic copyists or grammarians.

Four passages with πάρα have been cited as examples: Eur. Med. 441: σοὶ δ' οὔτε πατρός δόμοι . . . πάρα. Aesch. Eumen. 31: κεί παρ' Ἑλλήνων τινίς. Ar. Ach. 862: ἡμεῖς δ' ὅσοι θείβαθεν αὐληταὶ πάρα. Ar. Ach. 1091: αἱ πόρναι πάρα. In these commentators have persistently denied that πάρα can represent πάρεσι, but why it cannot no one has yet explained. They must be all following some

original who pointed out that *πάρα* with plural subjects is unusual, and then chose to call it impossible. Surely it was natural for Greeks to use it when required, as they used *ἐνι* for *ἐνείσιν* as well as for *ἐνεσσι*; see *Odyss.* 21, 288, *ἐνι τοι φρένες οὐδ' ἤβαιαί.*

Archimedes, de *Helic. Prop.* XXIV, p. 244, l. 35 (ed. Torelli), *καὶ ἀναγέγραπται ἀπὸ πασῶν ὁμοῖοι τομέες*, can certainly not be classed as a conscious mannerism or imitation of previous authors. Is it not a Doric relic of an old 3d plur. form, corresponding to *γεγραψάται* on the *Tab. Heracl.* 1, 121, perhaps coming in here from popular speech? It is noteworthy that 44 lines later we have *καὶ ἀναγεγράφονται ἀπὸ πασῶν ὁμοῖοι τομέες*, where the original 3d plur. has been assimilated to the present tense 3d plur. formation; but our copyist's trustworthiness cannot be relied on.

Two more passages of Hesiod need a little explanation: *Scut.* 245: *ἄνδρες δ', οἱ πρεσβῆες ἔσαν, γῆρας τε μέμαρπεν*, has been cited as an example by some who have taken *μέμαρπεν* as singular for plural, and translate as Gaisford—'who had reached old age.' No parallel to such a sense of *μάρπτω* has been found. The phrase must have been modelled on *Odyss.* 24, 390, *ἐπεὶ κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψεν*, or a similar phrase, and the clause is an additional paratactic clause: 'and old age seized on them.' Those who take the reading *μέμαρπον*, which is not so good, can say in defence that the author modelled it on the line from the *Odyssey* above, which he misread as 'seized on old age.' In *Hes. Theog.* 790, *ῥέει . . . Ὀκεανοῖο κέρας . . . ἐννέα μιν . . . εἰλιγμένος εἰς ἅλα πίπτει*, discarding Paley's 'simpler meaning,' we see that *ἐννέα (μοῖραι)* is in apposition to *Ὀκεανός* with which *εἰλιγμένος* agrees.

To Pindar are attributed 8 examples, in most of which the best authorities have changed the old reading, and other methods of clearing up the difficulty are possible. In *Olymp. XI (X)* 6 all MSS but one give:

μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι
ὑστέρων ἀρχαὶ λόγων
τέλλεται καὶ πιστὸν ὄρκιον μεγαλαῖς ἀρεταῖς.

A gives *ἀρχὰ*. Christ and Gildersleeve take the reading of A, 'and the example disappears.' It is not strange that *ἀρχαὶ* became the usual reading; a reciter or copyist would easily assimilate it to the neighboring plural *ὕμνοι*. Others who accept *ἀρχαὶ* have suggested that *τέλλεται* is due to the thought of the coming singular *ὄρκιον*. With either of these legitimate explanations the example is disposed of.

In Pyth. X 71, ἐν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι κείται πατρώϊαι κεδναὶ πολλῶν κυβερνάσιες, for κείται, the authority of most MSS is accepted by the grammarians—down to Thompson, 1883, but rejected by Christ (1882) and Gildersleeve (1885), who read κύνται. It is certainly better to accept κύνται. Or, to suggest another explanation, is κείται a relic of the old plural κέεται or κείαται, both of which occur in Homer?

A fragment of Pindar, IV 3, 16 (45, 16), is supposed to contain two examples. The best reading to take is Christ's:

τότε βάλλεται, τότ' ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἐραταὶ
ἴων φόβαι ῥόδα τε κόμαισι μίγνυνται,
ἀχέϊτ' ὀμφᾷ μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς,
ἀχέϊτε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί.

βάλλεται stands alone with its subject unexpressed, perhaps thought of as ἴα, and then the thought is amplified to ἴων φόβαι ῥόδα τε with a singular verb agreeing with its nearer subject ῥόδα, as is often found, v. Jebb on Soph. O. C. 7, 8. In 18, the return to the 2d person plural, ἀχέϊτε, is not unnatural for Pindar or Greek, and ἀχέϊτ' ὀμφᾷ is preferable to ἀχέϊται ὀμφαί; both ἀχέϊτε's satisfy the requirements of sense and rhythm; they have support from the reading of a Paris MS given by Schneidewin, οἰχνεῖτ' ὀμφᾷ.

Three more fragments of Pindar remain to be considered. In IV 6 (225) Christ reads:

κλυθ' Ἀλαλά, πολέμον θύγατερ,
ἐγγέων προοίμιον, ᾧ θύεται
ἄνδρες ὑπερ πόλιος τὸν ἱρόθυτον θάνατον.

Kirchhoff reads αἰθύεται. With the former reading, we must suppose ἄνδρες corrupt, or else the composer used θύεται metri gratia. It is best, however, to punctuate after αἰθύεται, and take ἄνδρες as the subject to some verb in a subsequent line lost.

In 265 and 285 we find: ἰάχει βαρυφθεγκτῶν ἀγέλαι λεόντων, and μελιρρόθων ἀνθέων ἔπεται πλόκαμοι. In the absence of the context we may be content to leave these lines in their obscurity; surely nothing ought to be built on such a poor basis as these two examples treasured up in the pages of an unscientific grammarian.

Finally, in Pindar, Pyth. IV 57, we have a passage that seems hopeless: ἡ ῥα Μηδείας ἐπέων στίχες.

a). The Schol. takes ἡ as equal to ἔφη and calls it σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν.

b). Some say ἡ is the imperf. plur. of εἰμί here.

c). Böckh read αἱ ῥα, 'these (were) . . .'

d). Paley read ἦν (= ἔφασαν) plural of ἦ in Homer's ἦ ῥα καὶ . . .

e). Christ reads ἦ ῥα.

Gildersleeve says 'ἦ ῥα, the Homeric asseveration, well suited to the solemn oracular passage'; and says the copula ἐστί, εἰσί is rare in Pindar; but here the imperfect is wanted. Pindar only uses ἦ ῥα in two other passages: as P. 9, 38, where it introduces a question as in Homer, and P. 11, 38, where it introduces the first of two alternatives, as in Homer also. So we are entitled to say that these words at the close of a speech: "Verily the rows of words (oracular verses) of *Medea*," are strange and abrupt even for Pindar. We may doubt, if not finally reject, *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* of the above explanations; but it would perhaps be presumptuous to declare any reading final.

II. In the case of Herodot. I, 26, ἐστί δὲ μεταξύ τῆς τε παλαιῆς πόλιος ἣ τότε ἐπολιορκέετο καὶ τοῦ νηοῦ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι: and 7, 34, ἐστί δὲ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι ἐξ Ἀβύδου ἐς τὴν ἀπάντιον, the verb comes first, and with it at the same time in the writer's mind is present a general notion as the subject, not στάδιοι, which is the complement, but τὸ μῆκος or τὸ διάστημα. Cp. 2, 6, αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐστὶ μῆκος τὸ παρὰ θάλασσαν ἐξήκοντα σχοῖνοι. The fact that the place described in 7, 34 was commonly known as τὸ ἑπταστάδιον can have nothing to do with the use of the singular verb. In speaking a Greek might often use such a form of expression, and when written down, if it did occur to him that the singular sounded strange with the plural following, he would allow it to stand as being countenanced by popular usage, just as it sanctioned ἔστιν οἱ κ. τ. λ. Parallels in modern languages are plentiful: as 'it is twelve miles to . . .'; 'il y a cent mètres'; 'il est cent usages qui . . .'

As in Herod. 7, 34, so we find in Aristoph. *Vespae* 58, ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστ' . . . δοῦλω διαρριπτοῦντε, no case of a singular verb with plural subject, but there is to be supplied a subject to ἐστί like τὸ δράμα, δοῦλω being the complement. We have more examples of ἐστί followed by plural complements in Plato, *Rep.* 5, 463 A, *Euthydemus* 302 C, and *Gorgias* 500 D.

The above usages were as natural as any form of concord to Greeks who were used to ἔστιν οἱ, ἔστιν οὗς (cf. καὶ ξένους ἂν πολλοὺς εἰσενεγκεῖν, ἔστι δ' ἄς ἂν καὶ πόλεις, in Xenophon), and even ἔστιν ἐν οἷς, as Thuc. 5, 25; but we should note that εἰσὶν οἱ occurs in Thuc. 6, 10; and rarely ἦν οἱ for ἦσαν οἱ, as Xen. *Anab.* 1, 5, 7, ἦν τούτων τῶν σταθμῶν οὗς πάνυ μακροὺς ἦλανεν.

To be contrasted with Herod. 7, 34 are certain passages such as Isocr. Panegy. p. 543, Plato, Leg. 5, p. 732 E, and Hdt. 6, 112, 3, which show real examples of disagreement of verb and subject: the verb being attracted to agree with the complement because it stands nearer than—in fact before—the subject. In Plato, Rep. 8, 562 the order is different, but it is the same case of attraction.

The passage often quoted, Thuc. 3, 36, προσξυνεβάλετο οὐκ ἐλδ-χιστον τῆς ὁρμῆς αἱ Πελοποννησίων νῆες ἐς Ἰωνίαν ἐκείνοις βοηθοὶ τολμήσασαι παρακινδυνεύσαι, where Kühner and many editors have gone astray, is capable of easy explanation. There is a change of construction from the expected cumbrous form τὸ and the infin. into a simpler and more convenient form of expression, the noun plainly put with the participle. αἱ νῆες stands just as occisus Caesar is used for the English abstract notion 'the death of Caesar'; the difficulty lying in the English rather than in the Greek, which was not fettered by formulated rules which would prevent naturalness of expression. The chances of a second reading causing a change in the form of the sentence to avoid the apparent collocation of singular with plural would vary with the temperament of the author. For similar cases cp. Thuc. 4, 26, αἴτιον δ' ἦν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προειπόντες, and 8, 9, αἴτιον ἦν with a participle. From this author one more passage remains to be considered: 2, 3: ἀμάξας καθίστασαν ἴν' ἀντὶ τείχους ἦ. On this Matthiae actually said, 'the author' had probably ἄρματα in his mind'; if Thucydides thought at all about a logical subject for ἦ, it would be τὸ σταύρωμα οἱ ὁ φραγμὸς or the like.

One grammarian has said 'the ἐστὶ or γίγνεται always comes first.' Three passages showing a part of the verb γίγνομαι may here be taken:

Andoc. 1, 45: ἀφ' ὧν ἐμοὶ ξενίαι καὶ φιλότιτες πρὸς πολλοὺς καὶ βασιλέας καὶ πόλεις καὶ ἄλλους ἰδίᾳ ξένους γεγένηται.

Plato, Sympos. 188 B: καὶ γὰρ πάχναι καὶ χάλασαι καὶ ἐρυσίβαι ἐκ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἀκοσμίας περὶ ἄλλα τῶν τοιούτων γίγνεται ἐρωτικῶν.

Plato, Rep. 363 A: ἵνα δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ εἶναι γίγνηται ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης ἀρχαί τε καὶ γάμοι καὶ ὅσα περ Γλαῦκων διήλθεν.

The simplest explanation of these three passages is to say that the use of the singular verb is a slip; the subjects being many, and the verb coming at a distance, the singular is used as if the whole of the names of things were taken as a neuter plural. This is satisfactory for the first two passages, where the verb comes

after the subjects; but in the last of the three it is possible that when the verb γίγνηται was written, the subjects were thought of differently, perhaps in some neuter plural form, which was then changed into detail. With regard to the second passage, it should not be forgotten that Sauppe has ejected γίγνεται, and the whole sentence is only an amplification of the preceding, so that the two sentences have probably been tampered with.

So in Plato, Timaeus 45 A, σκέλη μὲν οὖν χεῖρές τε ταύτη καὶ διὰ ταῦτα προσέφν πάντων, we must take χεῖρές τε (unless it be ejected as a later addition) as a later addition in thought; or the thought of σκέλη outweighed the expected influence of the after-thought. Again, it is possible to consider the whole subject as practically the same as one concrete neuter plural. With the former explanation compare Il. 17, 386 and 23, 380, quoted later.

We next consider Eur. Bacch. 1350: αἰαὶ δέδοκται, πρέσβν, τλήμονες φυγαί. The verb δέδοκται generally is used impersonally, or with neuter pronouns. The construction with δέδοκται here is of similar nature with the construction in Hdt. 7, 34 (above), and in δέδοκται ἐμοὶ φυγεῖν the infinitive may be called appositional or explanatory of the idea contained in δέδοκται; in the same way φυγαί stands here in apposition, and is not to be looked on as the subject. If any second thoughts arose in Euripides' mind on the form of the construction, he was debarred from using the plural δεδογμένοι εἰσίν. Apparently Euripides could not have written τλημόνως φυγεῖν: τλημόνως in the passages we know never means 'miserably,' but always 'patiently.' To suppose, as Kühner did, that δέδοκται = δέδοκνται, 'mit ausgefallenem ν,' is quite impossible.

Perhaps ῥάδιον δ' ἀπαλλαγαί, Med. 1375, helps to bear out the above remarks, and also Thuc. 3, 36 (above); but we can hardly class with them, as some have done, Phoen. 963, δῆλον οἷ γ' ἐμοὶ λόγοι.

It is impossible to believe that Euripides was ignorant of ἦν as a plural form when he wrote Ion 1146, or that he deliberately extended the usage of a singular verb with a plural subject, with the passages treated above, such as Hesiod, Theog. 321, 825, and Sophocles, Trach. 520 as justifications, or that he was aware of a condition that the singular verb must precede when so used. In Helen. 1358:

μέγα τοι δύναται νεβρῶν
παμποίκιλοι στολίδες,
κισσοῦ τε στεφθεῖσα χλόα
νάρθηκας εἰς ἱερούς . . .

we must explain by supposing that the first thought was different, perhaps was μέγα τοι δύναται χλόα, this being interrupted by an amplification νεβρῶν . . . στολίδες, which fitted into its place well metrically, and so δύναται was not changed for metrical reasons. The only possible alternative is to take δύναται as used in an impersonal way, and take στολίδες and χλόα as complements; thus the passage would be connected with those above with ἔστι, Hdt. 1, 26 and 7, 34. With the former explanation, however, we can compare the looseness of grammar due to a change of expression, seen in Plato, Theaet. 173 D: σπονδαὶ δ' ἐταιρειῶν . . . καὶ σύνοδοι καὶ δεῖπνα καὶ σὺν αὐλητρίσι κῶμοι-οὐδὲ ὄναρ πράττειν προσίσταται αὐτοῖς. The breaking off the sentence after κῶμοι is quite natural to the unstudied ease of Platonic dialogue; in English conversation the same interruption is quite common.

We may refer here to two passages in Homer containing similar inaccuracies of grammar; Il. 17, 386:

καμάτῳ δὲ καὶ ἰδρῶ . . .
γούνατα τε κνήμαί τε πόδες θ' ὑπένερθεν ἐκάστων
χεῖρές τ' ὀφθαλμοὶ τε παλάσσετο μαρναμένονιν

Il. 23, 380: πνοιῇ δ' Εὐμήλοιο μετάφρενον εὐρέε τ' ὦμω | θέρμετο. The verb in each case was taken by the writer as agreeing with the first subject; the later words being added as afterthoughts. It is possible too that the exigences of metre help to account for the singular, παλάσσοντο being inadmissible.

Again, it seems impossible to believe that Euripides deliberately joined a singular verb with a plural noun in Phoen. 349:

ἀνὰ δὲ Θηβαίαν | πόλιν ἐσιγάθη σὰς ἔσοδοι νύμφας,

where the best MSS give εἴσοδοι, the next best εἴσοδον, and also one of the good copies; many have εἴσοδος, which Porson read. Taking ἔσοδος to be the original, we account for the change to the plural as being an early copyist's slip in the first instance, which was perpetuated by other copyists and grammarians ready to see an example of the supposed σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν; possibly the ε for σ was a mistake in connection with the ε of εἴσοδος, a marginal gloss. If we are not content to read ἔσοδος, as Dindorf and nearly all since Seidler have read, we must fall back on the somewhat weak explanation that the first thought was ἐσιγάθη ἡ σὴ νύμφη ἐσιούσα, which was changed, as being too prosy, to the plural ἔσοδοι νύμφας, rather than ἔσοδος, possibly to avoid the coming together of three

words ending in *s*. In this case the passage would be classed with Thucyd. 3, 36 (above).

A difficult passage is seen in Hipponax 29 [12]:

δύ' ἡμέραι γυναικός ἐστιν ἡδισταί | ὅταν γαμῇ τις, κάκφ' ἔρη τεθνηκυῖαν.

All MSS have *ἐστιν* except one, which has *εἰσίν*; Gaisford, Bergk (1st ed. and 3d ed., 1883) read *εἰσίν*. There is no special reason why *ἐστιν* should have arisen if *εἰσίν* had been the author's word, unless all the MSS have one original, which have a copyist's slip, perpetuated by grammarians, glad to find support for their *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*. If this explanation be inadequate, it remains a mystery why popular recitation of the lines should not have altered the word; and if Hipponax really consciously put *ἐστί* after a plural subject, it is strange that it should never occur again in his writings or those of any other lyric poet. The better way out of the difficulty is to follow the best editors and read *εἰσιν*, rather than allow this passage to be put down as one of the irreducible minimum.

It will now have been seen how various is the nature of the examples set down as instances of the *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν*. To draw a few conclusions: the case of *ἦν* with plural subject is perfectly clear. Many, too, of the passages quoted in Section I of this paper need no further remark; some of them have been mentioned for no intrinsic difficulty, but merely because they have so often been cited to bolster up other passages. If in one or two the explanations given are not fully satisfactory, they can at least be said to hold the field at present, with the consent of many authorities. Again, we may at once set aside, as needing no further mention in connection with this subject, all the numerous disjunctive examples (as Pindar, Pyth. 10, 41, *νόσοι δ' οὔτε γῆρας οὐλόμενον κέκραται*), which are only referred to here because they have been so frequently quoted, though well classed apart by Kühner. We may set aside, too, all such passages as Soph. O. C. 7, 8, *αἱ πάθαι με χῶ χρόνος ξυνὸν μακρὸς διδάσκει*, where the singular verb agrees with the nearer of two subjects, a plural and a singular, on which Professor Jebb's note is adequate.

While many of the passages mentioned in Section II of this paper can be dismissed as admitting of simple explanations, such as by restoration of the original reading, or those given on Thuc. 3, 36, Herod. 1, 26, of others we can only say that, if the addition of words by an afterthought is not held to be satisfactory, we must take refuge in the fact that the singular is the

generic and the plural is the particular; but the number of passages that need to be explained thus is very small. And be it noticed, the oft-repeated dictum that the verb comes first has been shown above to be wrong. Enough has been said above of the attraction of a verb to its complement, and the conjunction of *ἔστι* and a plural complement; and no longer ought we to find in grammars this use of the copulative verb joined to the examples with ordinary verbs, treated above. The connection, too, of the *γίγνεται* examples with this use of *ἔστι* should cease. The few hopeless passages, such as Pindar, Pyth. 4, 57 and [Pindar] Fragments 225, 265 will perhaps never be cleared up; but in themselves they are slight foundations on which to build in the grammars a paragraph of examples of quasi-false concords of multitudinous forms.

Finally, the name *σχῆμα Πινδαρικόν* should be given up when it is seen that it is unjust to the memory of Pindar, and unsuitable to what comes under the head of many different *σχήματα*; and grammars should note the extended use of *ἦν* as a plural form, and omitting the doubtful examples, merely refer to the use of *ἔστι* with a plural complement, and the attraction of verbs to agree with complements.

R. S. HAYDON.

DEWSBURY, Yorkshire, England.

IV.—STYLE AND CHRONOLOGY IN CORNEILLE.

I.

The method of determining the chronology of an author's works—and also their genuineness—by their style has become a favorite one with students of the literatures of antiquity. In a recent number of this Journal (Vol. X, pp. 470-480), the editor, discussing Ritter's *Untersuchungen über Plato*, recommends to American scholars especially, as suited both to the national temperament and to the means at their disposal, the application of this method to Greek and Roman writers. Before engaging, however, in the mechanical pastime of counting gerunds and comparing connectives, the courage of the investigator would be materially increased could he be assured that such labor would lead in the majority of cases to definite results. Assurance on this point will, in the ordinary course of events, proceed but slowly from the field hitherto under inspection. The uncertainty of texts, the meagreness of biographical details—often indeed entirely wanting—the lack of contemporaneous records, both social and grammatical, combine to retard a consensus of opinion in even the most favorable case. If, on the other hand, the investigation can be transferred to more recent times, to a literature surrounded by abundant historical documents, and to a writer whose works are accurately dated, the qualities of the statistical method can be quickly gauged.

Of modern literatures that of France has experienced changes, the periods of which are unusually well defined. Both literature and language have shared in these transitions. The breaking up of the mediaeval inflections in the first part of the fourteenth century was followed by the introduction of Latinisms in the last part. The reform of the *Pléiade* in the sixteenth century, to be succeeded by that of the classicists in the seventeenth, occasioned not less than three generations of stylistic uncertainty. The more recent Romantic movement, headed by Rousseau, and the invasion of science mark by decades and almost by years the productions of the present age.

The literary form has varied with the thought as well. In the twelfth century Wace, representing the old school of simple notions and concise expression, competed in a chronicle of the Norman dukes for the favor of Henry II with Benoît de Sainte-More, of the new school of romantic sentiment and elaborate description. A century later the *Roman de la Rose* reveals its double authorship and its source in different worlds by the transformation of the mediaeval love lyric of Guillaume de Lorris into the satirical pre-renaissance manifesto of Jean de Meun. In the revival of learning, one and the same author, Clément Marot, starting from the lines laid down by tradition, passes through the refinement of Italian elegance and gains force from the new religious tendencies. Malherbe himself had his first and second manner. Henrietta of England caused Corneille and Racine to repeat, in their rival plays on Titus and Berenice, the experience of Wace and Benoît.

Of the periods of French literature the first part of the seventeenth century is particularly interesting for the conscious changes in the language of the educated classes. It saw the gradual triumph of the principle of order championed by Malherbe, the rise and fall of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, the beginning of the French Academy. Linguistic criticism was the order of the day. Documentary information regarding this half century is also abundant. The fluctuations in language and taste, seen in all the literary productions of the time, can be traced here in the successive works of a single author, Pierre Corneille. A dramatist, and therefore directly dependent on popular favor, Corneille showed himself peculiarly sensitive to the current views on language. In the course of his active career (1629-1674) he published often, separately and together, his various tragedies and comedies, and in 1660 revised and modified the editions which had previously appeared. We have thus a twofold indication of grammatical change in the works of Corneille: that given by a comparison of the successive plays with one another, and that found in each play by a comparison of the successive variants.¹ A means of testing results thus gained is afforded by the linguistic observations of Vaugelas (1647).²

¹ The edition of Corneille which furnishes all the readings is that of Marty-Laveaux in the series *Les Grands Ecrivains*, Paris, 1862, 12 vols. 8vo.

² *Remarques sur la Langue Française par Vaugelas*. Nouvelle édition par A. Chassang, Versailles and Paris, 1880, 2 vols. 8vo.

For conciseness and to avoid repetition this article will consider only the material derived from a reading of the variants, adding by way of interest references to confirmatory passages in Vaugelas.¹

II.

Considering, then, the changes of style as affected by language and grammatical constructions alone, we note first:²

(a) Changes in orthography in the various revisions by Corneille. In nouns: *cavalier* (*chevalier*, Le Cid 82, 86), *champ* (*camp*, Le Cid 1434, 1439). In adjectives: *bizarre* (*bigearre* to 1663, L'Ill. com. 1430; see V. II 5). In verbs: *arroser* (*arrouser*, Rod. 1526; see V. I 352), *avenir* (generally *advenir* to 1660, Mélite 1474), *exclurait* (*exclurrait*, Nic. 176), *trouver* (*treuver* in the finite moods of the earlier plays, La Suivante 10, 136, etc.) In adverbs: *donc* (*donques*, Mélite 1194, La Suivante 487), *même* (*mêmes*, Pol. 562; see V. I 79-81). In prepositions: *avec* (*avecque* to 1650, Clit. 42, And. 868).

(b) Of antiquated words and forms replaced by Corneille with later equivalents we note the substantives *cejourd'hui* (Mélite 1121, Le Menteur 763), *dam* (Mélite 1453), *heur* (Mélite 699, L'Ill. com. 814, often retained); the adjectives *bastant* (to 1639, Mélite 644, Médée 534), *bourrelle* (to 1639, Mélite 1363, Médée 801), *nompareil* (to 1637, La Veuve 1133, La Suivante 629); the verbs *bailler* (to 1637, Mélite 534, La Veuve 173; see V. II 39), *courre* (L'Ill. com. 676; see V. I 406), *galantiser* (La Gal. du P. 336), *gésir* (to 1656, Mélite 72, Horace 469), the contracted forms of the fut. and cond. of *laisser* (*lairrai*, etc., to 1644, Mélite 224, Le Cid 1695; see V. I 210); the adverb *dextrement* (to 1642, La Suivante 94, often retained); the interjection *sus* (Mélite 393, La Veuve 1081, often retained).

¹ The general subject of French grammar during the period in question is treated in *Die französische Syntax des XVII Jahrhunderts*, A. Haase, Oppeln, 1888, 8vo. See also article by Haase in *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Literatur*, Vol. XI *Abhandlungen*, pp. 203 ss. The lexicons published in *Les Grands Ecrivains* series contain also much valuable information and are, as a rule, preceded by a chapter on the grammar and syntax of the author under discussion.

² The abbreviations are: And. (Andromède), Clit. (Clitandre), Hér. (Héraclius), L'Ill. com. (l'illusion comique), La Gal. du P. (La Galerie du Palais), La Pl. R. (La Place Royale), Nic. (Nicomède), Perth. (Pertharite), Pol. (Polyeucte), Rod. (Rodogune), La Suite (La Suite du Menteur), Thé. (Théodore), V. (Vaugelas).

(c) Changes in gender were going on, as in the nouns *aide* (m. in *Mélite* 91, *Clit.* 90), *amour* (f. in *Pol.* 77, *And.* 934, m. in *Rod.* 585; see *V. II* 107). Also in agreement of adjective and pronoun, as *autre* with feminine antecedent (m. in *Mélite* 1425, *Pol.* 499, etc.)

(d) An interesting trait of the second quarter of the seventeenth century is revealed by the care which Corneille takes to express his thought more exactly. Thus, words loose in meaning, found in his early plays, give way to those more rigidly defined in the revisions. He substitutes in nouns, *joie* for *aise* (*Mélite* 201), or replaces the latter by an equivalent (*Horace* 316); *pensée* encroaches on *penser* (*Mélite* 1250), or the latter returns to the infinitive (*L'Ill. com.* 1265, often retained as a noun); in verbs, *consommer* becomes *consumer* (*Mélite* 574, *Le Cid* 489; see *V. I* 408), *impourvue* is corrected to *imprévue* (by 1644, *Mélite* 684, *L'Ill. com.* 1632), *informer* to *demandeur* (*La Suivante* 329, *Le Cid* 64); *lâcher* is found at first (1637) for *relâcher* (*La Pl. R.* 55), in the third sing. *peut* for *sait* (*La Veuve* 1469), *savoir* for *connaître* (*La Suite* 822), *songer* for *penser* (*L'Ill. com.* 930; see *V. I* 165), *soupirer* for *déplorer* (*Rod.* 1614), *tenir* for *garder* (*La Veuve* 991), but *garder parole* for *tenir p.* (*Don Sanche* 645; cf. *Perth.* 841); *je peux* is replaced by *je puis* (1644, *La Gal. du P.* 1; see *V. I* 142); the former prepositions *dedans*, *dessous*, *dessus* were gradually restricted to their use as adverbs, the first rigorously from 1648, the latter two less carefully (*Mélite* 1752, *Cinna* 531, *Le Cid* 1579); the more common prepositions were often interchanged: *à* for *de* (*La Pl. R.* 691, *Hér.* 475, 660), *à* for *en* (*Horace* 402, *Hér.* 48); *de* for *par* (*Mélite* 739), *en* for *à* (*L'Ill. com.* 1420, *Pompée* 521); in conjunctions *combien que* was dropped (*La Suivante* 1103), *d'abord que* changed to *sitôt que* (*Rod.* 289), *devant que* suppressed (*Cinna* 792) or remains (see *V. I* 435), *paravant que* replaced by *avant que* (*La Veuve* 735, etc.); in adverbs *comme* sometimes yields to *comment* (*La Suivante* 548, *Hér.* 850; see *V. II* 12) or to *que* (*Mélite* 304, *Horace* 266), and *lors* to *alors* (*Clit.* 1623, *Horace* 1219; see *V. I* 360); of adverbial phrases *à tout le moins* disappears (*Mélite* 78, *L'Ill. com.* 1516), *au demeurant* is dropped (*La Suivante* 315; see *V. II* 5), *au moins* often gives way to *du moins* (*Mélite* 1678, *Clit.* 990), *à la foule* is replaced by *en foule* (*Thé.* 189, *Pompée* 1655), *à faute de* by *faute de* (*Mélite* 172, *La Suivante* 1253; see *V. II* 202); *du depuis* (*Le Menteur* 1701; see *V. I* 287) and *de pied coi* (*La Pl.*

R. 889) disappear, as does *en cervelle* (to 1634, *Mélite* 1152, etc.); verbal phrases are more rigidly distinguished: *donner ordre* is later corrected to *mettre ordre* (Pol. 1714), *faire doute* to *douter* (1634, *La Veuve* 1860), *régler par* or *pour* to *régler sur* (1644, *Pompée* 1594), and *traiter en* to *traiter de* (Pol. 134, *Perth.* 1802).

(e) Among constructions which became, during the career of Corneille, wholly or partly obsolete are the adjective phrases: *un seul* (*Florame*) for *F. seul* (*La Suivante* 1273), *que de vous pareille* for *que vous de p.* (*La Suivante* 446); the pronominal phrase *un chacun* (to 1634, *Mélite* 537); and in verbs, *craindre à* for *craindre de* before dependent infinitive (*Thé.* 909), *croire à* for *croire* with acc. (*Mélite* 288; see V. II 388), *pouvoir* without supplementary infinitive (*La Gal. du P.* 791, Pol. 24).

(f) Other signs of increasing care in the use of grammatical constructions are seen in the mood and tense changes of verbs: the preterit is frequently replaced by the perfect (*Mélite* 652, *Pompée* 1487); the subjunctive is often made over to the conditional (*La Veuve* 748, *La Suite* 737), the second of two successive imperatives (where the first is *allons*) is once corrected to an infinitive (*Hér.* 1916).

(g) The negative is gaining in the revisions of Corneille the place in the sentence which it holds to-day; the popular omission of *ne* is remedied (*La Veuve* 628, *Horace* 1097; see V. I 342), *pas* is brought before the infinitive it limits (*Mélite* 48, *Rod.* 529; see V. II 128), and *ne* in the phrase *il faut* plus an infinitive is put after *faut* (*Horace* 1572, Pol. 74). In negative phrases Corneille, in his revision of 1660, prefers no *ne* after *de peur que* (*La Gal. du P.* 395, *Rod.* 538), but inserts it in *sans—plus* (*Rod.* 1678). In this connection the later treatment of *de* without the article after negatives, adverbs of quantity, and certain verbs shows a more polished style (*La Pl. R.* 1522, *Le Cid* 1262, *Pompée* 1618); also after *que* before an infinitive (*Cinna* 831).

(h) In regard to the order of verb and pronominal object the variations of Corneille are very noticeable. In the case of two successive imperatives the object of the second is placed after it in 1660 rather than before, as at first (*Le Cid* 59, *Pompée* 708). The first edition (1668) of *Attila* had also the latter construction (v. 1240). The position of the pronoun object of an infinitive directly dependent (without prepositions) on a preceding verb occasioned much trouble to Corneille. In the early plays the

object of the infinitive is almost always found before the principal verb. In 1660, in nine cases out of ten at least, he has changed it to the usual position—before the infinitive as at the present day (*Mélite* 136, *Clit.* 42, *Horace* 157–158, *And.* 1342, *Perth.* 742; see *V.* II 84); but the reverse is also true, particularly when *devoir* or *oser* is the principal verb (*And.* 957, *Nic.* 810, *Othon* 203). In the case of inversion of subject, common in the first editions after *à peine* and *aussi*, the revision returns to the normal order (*La Pl.* R. 793, *Le Menteur* 1559, *Thé.* 1283).

(i) Inasmuch as the mass of Corneille's works are poetical in form, his improvement in versification can also be adduced as an indication of chronology. In his later editions he is more careful in regard to a hiatus (*Le Menteur* 936, *Hér.* 127), but his more noteworthy change is the substitution of a sonorous syllable for the mute *e* which counted as a syllable (*Mélite* 18, *Clit.* 139, *Médée* 99, *Le Cid* 731). The rime indicates at times changes in pronunciation, but rather in different plays and not in the variants of the same play.

III.

The results thus reached from a study of the most striking alterations in the variants of the works of Corneille would seem to prove conclusively that at times of linguistic and grammatical change the statistical method can be safely followed. Hence the inference would be that in periods when standards of style are fixed there are slight alterations due to the fact that language, like all living organisms, both grows and decays. Certain changes, though few in number, have been noted in the plays of Corneille subsequent to 1660. It is conceivable, however, that a rigid academic style, resting on tradition, might rule for generations the literature of a people, and thus make all intrinsic study unsatisfactory in conclusions, if not absolutely sterile. Here a sure guide could be found alone in semi-literary authors. On the other hand, it is presumable that the authors of antiquity who have survived the ruin of their peoples include the highest talent of their civilizations, and thus mirror, as do all leaders, the phases of the popular mind. The general attribute of blind copying of predecessors in authority could not be said without investigation to characterize the greater part of them.

There are other indications of change to be found in the works of Corneille, and which reveal progress in sentiment. These can-

not be cited as proofs applicable everywhere, owing to the fact that all authors, especially those of the subjective schools of philosophical essays and lyric effusions, are not directly subservient from day to day to the public voice.¹ Without entering, therefore, on an extended discussion of the opinions of Corneille as given in his writings, we shall content ourselves with stating that in literature, in politics, in fashion, and in prejudices he vibrated with the Parisian of the rule of Richelieu, of the Fronde, and of the rising years of Louis XIV.²

F. M. WARREN.

¹A study of Corneille, as reflecting in his works the thought and taste of his age, was presented in 1887, by the writer of this article, to the Johns Hopkins University, as a doctor's dissertation.

²The last number of the *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* (Vol. LXXXIV, pp. 71 foll.), continues an article by K. Fahrenberg, *die Entwicklungsgänge in der Sprache Corneille's* (*Archiv*, Vol. LXXXIII, pp. 129 ff. and p. 273 ff.; Vol. LXXXIV, p. 71), with an exhaustive study of the linguistic and syntactical development of Corneille's works.

V.—UNCONVENTIONAL USES OF NATURAL IMAGERY IN THE POEMS OF WALTHER VON DER VOGEL- WEIDE.

Wilmanns (Leben, 173) says: 'Walther does not seek for any harmony between summer joys and those of love, nor does he wish to contrast them: he mentions them together, in order to compare their power.' But 99, 6 proves at least a harmony. The poet does not here 'declare summer and winter alike good' (Wilmanns, Gedichte Walthers, 2 Aufl. 350). The analogy (*dā von sol man wizzen daz*) is between winter, as representing some among the *elliu wip* who should be honored, and summer, as prefiguring *die besten*, who shall be honored more. 42, 15 f. is a still clearer example. The 'careful' man is to find relief in the thought of 'good women' and of summer's bright days. *Wan daz ich mich rihte nâch der heide* (20) does not, therefore, mean simply that the winter-bound poet 'thinks of summer' (Wilmanns³, 210): he is to include *guotiu wip*. The *walt*, in its earliest green, is the object of joy espied by the heath, and represents good women; while the poet expressly reserves for himself the character of the later-blooming heath, blushing at its tardiness. The next stanza then appropriately specializes: *frowe, als ich gedenke an dich*.

The same editor, in commenting on 64, 13 f., finds the climax of heath, wood and field strange, and gives that as a reason for casting additional doubt on the genuineness of the exquisite song 51, 13. The difficulty admits of adjustment, if Lachmann's idea that the two stanzas are a dialogue (Wechsel) is given up. BC have *diu mir ist liep, der bin ich leit* (21); E, *der—dem bin ich leit*; but E, on the other hand, has preserved the stanza, as a whole, better than BC have done. Burdach's view (Reinmar der Alte und Walther von der Vogelweide, 110), that the complaint of the lady is like the oldest 'Frauenstrophen,' and that the poem is therefore among Walther's earliest, calls for no further consideration, if the reading of E be abandoned. The context shows that this should be done: 'However¹ fine and gay the heath looks in her varied colors, yet for the wood I claim far more lovely things;² still better has it gone with the field.' This is a climax, not of beauty alone, but

¹ *swie* BC, *wie* E; cf. also Pfeiffer, Germania, 5, 41.

² *dinge* BC, as against *varwe* E.

of beauty that dispenses blessings;¹ and contains hidden praise of his mistress. This is openly avowed in the next stanza: 'the while I sing, I ever find new and befitting praise of her. Let her receive this tribute kindly: another time I shall praise more.' The 'new words of praise' (*ein niuwe lop daz ir gezimet*) can refer only to the first stanza, where the bright colors of the heath are a token of Summer's labor. But the goddess has then fashioned the *vil mære wünneclicher dinge* of the forest, and has crowned her tasks with the fruitful field. There exists a direct parallel between these three and the three things which a perfect woman, according to the minnesinger code, should possess: *schæne, liebe, tugent*.² These are then partially summed up in the concluding verses: *ez tuot in den ougen wol daz man si siht: und daz man ir vil tugende giht, daz tuot wol in den bren*. The correspondences are: *schæne, heide*; *liebe* (Anmuth), the *wünneclichiu dinc* of the grove; *velt* (and *walt*), *tugent*.

But while Walther deepens the natural poetical images of flower, field and forest into ethical thought, he returns, on the other hand, to the harmless gayety of the popular and traditional 'Natur-egang.' But this gayety, unlike that of the Neidharts and Neifens,³ has a foundation in thought as well as in ebullitions of feeling, real or feigned; and this thought he delicately varies in new images, and in new forms of old figures. The delight which

¹ Cf. The Stricker's *Frauenehre*, Z. f. d. A. 7, 508: *mir geschiht als einem man geschiht der ein vil grôzen walt siht: sol er rehte sagen mære was an dem walde wære, daz möhte nimmer geschehen* (1101). *wie wol lobe ich einen walt, dâ die bôume sint ungezalt die all volle tugende stânt unt desto minner niht enhânt, swie vil man ir geniuzet, sî si des niht bedriuzet: sine stên mit tugenden geladen, und mitte sint dîne schaden* (1113). *boum der tugende* (1174). *boum von höher kost* (1175). According to Wackernagel, *Lit. Gesch.* I §79, 21, Stricker borrows from Walther. *der sich erjungen wolde sît in dîner tugende walde* (Wb. 3, 472a). Otto Lüning, *Die Natur* (1889), p. 148, notes that the epic word *tan* (in which were no food trees) is scarcely used in the minnesong.

² Cf. 50, 5; 92, 19-21; MSH 2, 183b (35); Iwein, 340.

³ Reinmar represents the other extreme (MF 169, 11): *was dar umbe, valwent grüene heide? solher dinge vil geschiht; der ich aller muoz gedagen: ich hân mē ze tuonne danne bluomen klagen*. Scherer (*Litt. Gesch.*, 5 Aufl., 205) contrasts Reinmar's attitude with that of his younger contemporary: 'Walther dagegen hat, ohne je Natur und Liebe auf conventionelle Weise zu verbinden, die Jahreszeiten wiederholt besungen und dem allbekannten Stoffe neue Seiten abgewonnen.' But it was not the easy superiority of genius, working with clear intention, that achieved these results. There is every indication that Walther's comparisons from nature are steeped in the simple conventionalism of earlier song. His style lacks entirely the audacity displayed by the metaphor of the Renaissance. But it is none the less a triumph, when his inven-

these afforded the poet, and the value he himself attached to them in his poetry, have not been recognized sufficiently. Ernst Hamann (*Der Humor Walthers von der Vogelweide*, Rostock 1889, p. 20) thinks that 114, 27 *dâ sach ich bluomen striten wider den klê, weder ir lenger wære* is 'dem Kinderleben abgelauscht.' Insipid judgment! Walther's range is not that of the modern nursery, though his love-scholasticism (cf. Uhland's 'verliebte Scholastik,' V 62) may have helped people it with his fancy's children. According to Wilmanns (384), the theme of the song last mentioned (114, 23 f.) is a joyous welcome to Spring, addressed by the poet to his mistress and a larger audience, whom he then calls on to share in the jollities to follow. Rieger (61) calls it a spring song, written after illness. Pfeiffer-Bartsch (6 Aufl. 142) find in it sad recollections, and place it in Walther's later years. All the editors suppose the lady to be present, and Rieger tries to reconcile this with the languid tone of sadness pervading the verses. With this I cannot agree. Adopting the reading of E, *nû hært irs* (25), the first strophe concludes: 'Twas there I saw flowers vying with the clover, which of them were taller. This story I told my lady.' In place of the perfect, as in 118, 36 *disen wünneclichen sanc hân ich gesungen mîner frowen ze êren. des sol si mir wizzen danc*, the preterite is here used, referring to some past not further defined. Wilmanns' rendering (386) 'er hat seiner Frau die Kunde gebracht' is forced. Nor is it easy, on his supposition, to explain the introduction of his mistress here, with no other reference whatever to her in the poem. 114, 27-29 is a reminiscence—in all probability a direct reminiscence of 51, 34. In order to prove this, it will be necessary, in the next pages, to take up certain matters not directly connected with the subject of this paper.

No satisfactory explanation of the third stanza has ever been given. Lachmann's emendation *dâ nâch* (115, 2) has not been adopted. Wackernagel-Rieger and Wilmanns print the reading of CE *dennoch*, but the editor last named 'does not understand it,' and approves of Bechstein's idea that a comparative like *gerner* would be in place. Pfeiffer-Bartsch retain *dennoch*, and take the meaning to be: 'And in addition I should have to give up, etc.'

tion, rising above the atmosphere that envelops him, discovers clarified figures which create a new vogue. 'His delights were dolphin-like; they showed his back above the element they lived in' (Shakesp., *Ant. and Cleop.* V 2).

¹ For the meaning, it is immaterial whether the demonstrative *dâ*, as distinct from the temporal *dâ*, refers to *ê* (25) 'formerly,' or to the blooming heath of that former season. In either case, the scene and the occasion are identical.

In either case the interpretation does not satisfy. I prefer to continue the sense through 115, 4, to read (with C) *müeze*, and to translate: 'But yet, if it so be that I must² relinquish all the joy I possessed erewhile—God bless you all!' And you, wish now that good hap may befall me! 115, 4, as expressing the resignation with which the poet accepts the fate implied in the condition, is only an unusually bold instance of what Burdach (75) calls Walther's 'Reichtum an Ausrufen, welche die feste Kette der syntactischen Gliederung keck und lebendig zerreißen.' In this case it is not his usual gayety, but deep pathos, which elicits the exclamation. The poet is contemplating an alternative like death, or complete withdrawal from the world; and pronounces a parting benediction on all good folk (34) who have been made *frô* by his art in past years. The following instances illustrate this meaning of *fröide lāzen*: Parz. 119, 15, *suln vögele durch mich freude lān?* Hartmann (MF 210, 27), *der fröide min den besten teil hāt er dā hin, und schüefe ich nū der sēle heil, daz wære ein sin* (this outweighs Walther 97, 12, and Dietmar, MF 39, 29). Ulrich von Singenberg (Wackernagel-Rieger 246), *nū wünschen ime dur sinen werden hōveschen sanc, sit dem sin vröide sī ze wege, daz sin der sūeze vater nāch genāden phlege*. The last passage cited, which exactly reproduces Walther's thought, and which must refer to the lapse of the poet's earthly joys in death, is part of a poem which is in all probability (as I hope to show) an adaptation of Walther 100, 24 f. But aside from this wider question, 101, 21 *got gebe iu, frowe, guote naht: ich wil ze herberge varn* corresponds with 115, 4 *got gesegen iuch alle*, and the following

¹ That *dennoch* occurs in the adversative sense is proved by passages like Parz. 177, 17: *der wāren dennoch niht wan driu*. Benecke's rendering of Iwein 3762, etc., 'sogar da noch,' 'zu der zeit noch' (Wb. zu Iw. 2 Ausg. 38), seems to be the result of a too sweeping theory, which refuses to every passage the modern meaning 'dennoch.' The mild adversatives 'still,' 'and still,' occupy in English this debatable ground. But *dannoch* in Iw. 3762 ('nevertheless') is stronger.

² In 112, 3 *müeste* has this meaning ('contingere,' Wb. II¹ 269b, 49) in the corresponding unreal condition. Paul (Gram.² §285) gives this as a wish; but this must be an inadvertence, as he places a comma after *lesen* (112, 4) in his edition of the poems. Cf. J. Knepper, *Tempora und Modi bei Walther von der Vogelweide*, Lingen, 1889, p. 17. Iwein 6159.

³ Not only are conditional sentences with no introductory particle in the apodosis common enough (116, 36); the exclamation itself as apodosis is by no means rare. Examples are: Parz. 154, 10; 269, 18; 486, 28; Willehalm, 66, 30 (cf. Herm. Göhl, *Modi in den Werken Wolframs*, Leipzig, 1889, p. 35); Walther, 74, 6: *st mir ieman lieber, maget oder wîp, diu helle müeze mir geuemen!*

line *wünschet noch daz mir ein heil gevalle* finds its echo in Ulrich's concluding wish, as cited above. It cannot be objected to this explanation that *ein heil, ein mannes heil*, etc., usually refers to temporal good fortune. The expression shares in the languor of the poem, and in the euphemism of its close. *einem heils wünschen* is used in both meanings in Parzival; cf. 224, 7, and 108, 28 *mit ritterlichem prise er starp. nû wünscht im heils, der hie ligt*. The situation in 115, 4, though perhaps more solemn than that in 66, 31, is illustrated by it: *min minnesanc der diene in dar, und iuwer hulde si min teil*. It appears to be a fair inference that 114, 23 f. was written towards the close of Walther's life; and this is supported by the tone of the poem. But whether it is through a winter's sickness, or through a vista of years, or both, the poet's view is fixed in retrospect on the sunny fields of art and spring. There is no force in Wilmanns' idea (386) that the figure in 51, 13, as exhibiting a far greater degree of poetical skill, indicates that 114, 23 was written first. The musing poet of 114, 23 is in no frame of mind to provoke a trial of wit with his younger self, '*weder ir lenger wære*'; he simply refers to 51, 13 as a poem already existing.

The consideration just mentioned brings us back to the subject proper of this paper. The fact of Walther's having 'repeated' his own figure has caused much trouble. Wackernagel-Rieger, xxii, declare it most improbable that he should have 'used the same *motif* twice.' Relying on the sole authority of A, they give 51, 13 to Leutold von Seven, with whose poems it has 'die sprechendste Familienähnlichkeit.' But against all this we have Walther's plain statement: 'It was there I saw ['saw' as poet, in a figure] flowers vying with the clover, which of them were taller. This story' I told my lady.' The reference to 51, 34 is plain.

¹ *mære* 'poetical invention.' In the same manner, the meaning 'news' (56, 15) rises in 56, 23 (the plural form, as in 114, 29), but without detriment to the truth of the *mære*, to that of 'a poet's praise in song.' On the other hand, 106, 4 *gefüegelt manec mære*, which is translated by Wilmanns (367) 'manches Lob zu Stande gebracht,' seems rather to mean 'brought many a doubtful affair to a happy close.' Cf. Iwein 6584, *got der müeze vüegen in des morgens bezzer mære dannie er getræstet wære* ('make a better story come true, than he had been fearing'). This explanation becomes more probable if 106, 6 *waz sol diu rede beschænet?* can be made to refer back to *mære füegen* (as euphemistically used), as well as to introduce verse 7. The keenest thrust in this would then be the reference (pointed out by Wilmanns, Leben 109) to occasions like that in 11, 36, where Walther sang before Kaiser Otto a *mære*, as truth, to cover up the Margrave's political chicaneries. In his plea for the poet (AFDA 9, 356), Burdach demands proofs 'dass er mit bewusstsein und aus eigennutz

If the importance attached to this figure of speech by the poet himself¹ had been perceived, the six strophes of the latter song would, in all probability, have remained a unit in the editions, and not have been divided (Lachmann) at 51, 37. Wilmanns' proposed re-arrangement of the strophes (236) does not help matters. The third and fourth stanzas, the only ones given in the *Carmina Burana*, are the kernel of the poem, and belong together. 52, 1. 2 are a variation of the maxim 'wer Schaden hat darf für Spott nicht sorgen.' The *schaden* (2) is explained by (4) *owê so verlornen stunde* (cf. also 53, 7), and there is 'Spott' in the *lachen* (51, 38). This mocking smile on the part of his lady (*rôler munf*), which has remained somewhat enigmatical, is now susceptible of explanation. The object of the 'Natureingang' in a spring song is usually to attune the hearers, and notably one fair listener, to the merriment of song and dance: the precursors of longed-for tokens of *genâde*. Most minnesingers can go no further; but we have seen that Walther refined upon the love summons by the invention of a figure of speech which he looks back upon with subdued pleasure, years afterwards. In view of 114, 29 *miner frowen seit ich disiu mære*, it is evident that in 51, 13 the lady, though not yet specially introduced, is intended by the poet to be listening quietly, as convention demanded, to his impassioned introduction. But she is surprised out of her equanimity by this highest capriole of Walther's fancy (51, 34): *wol dir, meie, wie dû scheidest allez âne haz! wie wol*

gelogen.' Aside from the question of motive—which appears here for the first time in the argument—Burdach scarcely strengthens his position by ascribing Walther's assurances of the Meissner's good faith to his 'erregbares temperament,' and by the novel idea that 'ruhig erwägende kritik war ihm nicht gegeben.' The historical evidence as to Walther's political leanings in this affair has been collected by Wilmanns. The question here can only be, what does the poet himself say? In the rendering proposed above, 106, 3-8 must at least be held to indicate that the services referred to were of a high-soaring political character: in all probability dangerous and adroit diplomatic attempts. 106, 6 *was sol diu rede beschânet?* flings at his hearers the defiant confession of one of the best natures in an age of violent action and intrigue, when all virtue—and especially all political virtue—has become more than ever militant and comparative: 'forging, through swart arms of offence, the silver seat of innocence.' The man who can afford to make this confession is quite capable of looking after his own reputation; and we learn from Burdach, on the same page, that 'no one at the present time will represent the German Middle Ages as an ideal.'

¹ Cf. Ulrich von Singenberg, WR 253, 10 (imitation of Walther 75, 32 [and of this passage?]): *genuoge sprechent 'sing als ê, prüef uns die bluomen und den klê!' die wellent niht das ich verstê, was mir dar an ze herzen gê.*

dû die boume kleidest, und die heide baz! diu hât varwe mê.¹
'du bist kurzer, ich bin langer,' alsô stritents âf dem anger,
bluomen unde klê. At this she laughs (37) in what the poet takes to be a beauty's petulance, rather than in disdain. The tone then sinks to the level of a lover's expostulation, and concludes in that strain.

I fail to see the force of Burdach's idea (152), that this is a poem 'in the prevailing fashion,' with the occurrences—if not the lady—feigned; or, that at best 'the poet confronts his mistress quite unconcernedly, assuming a tone of lofty admonition towards her.' The prime characteristic of the verses is the unfashionable beauty of the metaphor used; and it is no transient flame, but his unforgotten mistress, who smiles—but smiles aloof—at the seduction of this figure of speech, till then unheard of.²

The place of rural imagery in the poetical economy of Walther's *sprûche* is in marked contrast to the office of such figures in the song. If the minne-poet 'translates the stubbornness of fortune into so quiet and so sweet a style,' the needy sonneteer at court, 'with wit more ripe,'³ makes heath and grove help build his fire and boil his pot (21, 4 f.), or bids them trudge (35, 22). 28, 3 gives his normal thought in the later *sprûche*: *gerne wolde ich, möhte ez sin, bi eigem fiure erwarmen. zâi wiech danne sunge von den vogellinen, von der heide und von den bluomen, als ich wilent sanc!* and (8) *sus kume ich spâte und rîle fruo: gast, wê dir, wê! sô mac der wirt wol singen von dem grünen klê.* Ulrich von Singenberg's parody (Lachm. 153, WR 211) catches up Walther's point of view, and adapts it to his own easy circumstances: *sus rîle ich spâte und kume doch hein, mirst niht ze wê: dâ singe ich von der heide und von dem grünen klê.* Walther stamped the contrast, at least in these sharp outlines, with his own originality. Ulrich's only merit is that he recognized the value of the new mintages, and helped give them currency and conventionality.

Paul (PBB 8, 174-5) assails Burdach's view (118, and PBB 8, 468-9) that 28, 4-7 distinguishes between 'hohe und niedere Minne.' Paul justly maintains that descriptions of nature are not

¹ Cf. The Marner (MSH 2, 239; imitating Walther): *Schouwet, wie diu heide lît, die der winter twanc: si hât liechten schîn mit den bluomen dur daz gras in ir varwe gesundert, hundert ist ir, niht mê, grünen klê sach ich âf der heide, dâ was ich ê.*

² The question of the priority of the verses in the Carmina Burana does not affect the conclusion.

³ Cf. Rubin (MSH 3, 31): *Walther, dâ bist von hinnen, mit dinen wîsen sinnen; du hete ouch herren gunst.*

foreign to the court song;¹ and it was shown above that when Walther looked back upon his art as a whole, he selected an image eminently rural. On the other hand, further investigation may be able to show that the tranquil but tender remembrance, in which the coy beauty of 51, 13 is still held in 114, 23, helps to raise this whole group of songs to a higher plane. The 'niedere Minne' of Walther's happiest verses would then be less open to suspicions of stealthy and transient amours (Paul, PBB 8, 174), and part at least of his love-poetry would appeal in a higher degree to modern tastes. But in 28, 1-10 the case is quite different. Walther is here not thinking of 'high or low love' at all, but simply of the contrast between a homeless singer and a comfortable householder; cf. 28, 35, *daz ich den sumer lust und in dem winter hitze hân*.

This is the obverse of the country pictures in Walther's *sprüche*. But there appears to be a reverse, not unlike that illustrated above in the songs. It seems to me probable that a naïve bucolic tone in one of the earlier *sprüche* gave rise to a pretty piece of literary 'sparring'. This, with other sharp experiences, the history of which we cannot trace, may have wrought the lasting change in the poet's style, making him more worldly wise, and in one case (28, 7) even cynical.

20, 31 f. has very generally been classed among the earliest *sprüche* written at Vienna. The style is immature,² and the poet

¹ Heinrich von Morungen (MF 139, 19) furnishes additional proof of the scope of the 'hohe Minne.' The poet hears loud voices and sweet song on the heath, and finds his mistress there, dancing and singing; and in this sport he joins her. No mention is made of other dancers on the green, nor of a linden tree; but is not this because the poet wishes to concentrate our interest on his lady in his three rare portraits of her? In the following stanza the scene is changed, von der Hagen (IV 124) thinks to a 'kämmerchen'; and in the final verses she is on the castle battlements, where he, a messenger, finds her. Haupt's explanation, *gesamt* for *gesamt* (140, 2), seems far-fetched (cf. Gottschau, PBB 7, 336 f., for Heinrich von Morungen's position in life). Burdach (47) conceives Morungen's lady to have been of princely rank, which would only confirm the applicability of love scenes and jollities out-of-doors to the 'hohe Minne.' Why the same writer (52) places the first stanza last, does not appear. The poem, as it stands, gives us a passionate climax, quite in Morungen's style.

² 13, 19-25 (one of the latest songs) furnishes an example of Walther's fine ethical applications of early metaphors of his own like that in 20, 35 and 21, 5. But Wilmanns' explanation ('between heavenly and temporal joys') is not satisfactory, even with *zwein* (20) retained. How can the temporal joys be possessed, if the *müezegen liute* sit down between the two? But if *zwein*, as 'gegen sinn und vers' (Lachmann), be omitted, *fröiden* (20) suits the meaning of *state fröiden* (25), and the now-consistent metaphor may be taken as a

is more modest in his demands than was the case later.' The passage in question is 21, 1-9. Walther's patron, the duke, appears in three characters in six verses. He is a refreshing rain, a heath off which no end (*wunder*) of flowers may be plucked, and finally, assuming his own character, he is to pluck a 'leaf' off this heath for the poet. Such a piece of work may be compared instructively with 35, 7, which was written during Walther's best years. *der Dürnge bluome* [Duke Hermann], who *schînet dur den snê*, is compared with those whose praise *gruonet und valwet sô der klê*. The style in 21, 1 is crude and bungling compared with such perfection. The picture of Leopold submitting to this 'plucking' is not far from the confirmed bad taste of a spring song by Gottfried von Neifen (MSH I, 47b): *diu heide ist worden swanger*. Wilmanns (151) has pointed out that in 21, 6 *und bræche mir ein blat dar under sin vil mitte richiu hant* Walther not only destroys his metaphor, but substitutes a figure more appropriate to a tree than to a heath. Instances in this very period are recorded, where a gold (or silver) leaf, plucked from a golden-leaved tree erected at the jousting place, served as the reward of valor in the lists. Is it not natural to suppose that the duke, amused at the figure in which his generosity was invoked, should have answered the poet in terms suited to his appeal? 35, 17 f. makes this highly probable, and seems itself to be Walther's retort to the duke. No *spruch* has given rise to more discussion than 35, 17, and none has so vexatiously eluded explanation; cf. Uhland, V 61; Lachmann, 162; Rieger, 28; Menzel, 274; Wilmanns, Leben, 58; Paul, 9. It is with the utmost deference to these names that I offer the following contribution to the discussion.

35, 18, at least, is plain. The duke has wished the poet off 'to the woods'; but it is not at all evident that he put the meaning into the wish which Walther chooses to find in it. 35, 20, *dû wünschest underwilent biderbem man dun weist joch wie* refers either to the sinister meaning of *ze walde wiünschen* ('to wood and waste,' 'to —'), or to some other disagreeable implication, which the duke did not stop to consider. The joke, if there was a joke (Rieger, 28; Paul, 9), can have been only on the side of the duke. Walther is so beside himself, that in his attempt to reminiscence of the situation and figure of speech in 20, 35. *blat* (13, 23) becomes an eloquent commentary on the same word in 21, 6, and on princes' favors as among the fleeting things.

¹ Wilmanns, Leben 54. 57. 284. 303. According to Paul (Gedichte Walthers, 9), the verses were written during a later visit at Vienna. Burdach (AfdA 9, 346) thinks they may not be older than 25, 26.

turn the tables on his patron he lacks his usual mastery, and betrays deep chagrin. The climax is reached in 35, 22, *vil sælic si der walt, dar zuo diu heide!* ('the forest can stay forest, for all me, and the heath to boot!'). This explosion, the violence of which Leopold may never have forgiven (Lachmann), points to something harder for the poet to bear than a temporary rebuff. Leopold, though a patron of singers (*liberalis et gloriosus*), had a practical mind (Wilmanns, *Leb.* 54). This something which roused the poet appears to have been a slighting reference on the duke's part to the fantastic unrealities of the minnesinger style and vocabulary. Such ridicule was common, and instances of it will be produced below. In the case of 20, 31 f. matters are still worse; for those mummers of song are here masquerading in the *spruch*, out of character. They beg for very substantial alms; and the affected daintiness they introduce into this serious business is not only incongruous, it is most inartistic.¹ I have accordingly ventured to connect 20, 31 f. with 35, 17, and to assume that Leopold (*vir facundissimus et litteratus*; cf. Menzel, 117), marking in the former piece the poet's extravagant style—paired with the ridiculous, mock-modest request (21, 6)—answered in this fashion: "you ask for a 'leaf'; may you pluck your fill of them 'in the woods,' and on your fine heath!"

Whatever degree of probability may be claimed for this supposition,² the question whether 35, 17 was the rejoinder to a *similar* wish on the part of Leopold, still remains. It was seen above that Walther attaches great importance to the poetical use of heath and wood in his songs. But the 'Gegensang' heaps ridicule upon the extravagant and sentimental use of similar *motifs* by later minnesingers. Did this 'Gegensang,' as a form of art, already exist, and did it find a patron in the duke? Neidhart reached Austria much later, and his first (and only?) connection with Leopold must have been his participation in the crusade which the latter organized in 1217 (Keinz, *Lieder Neidharts*, 1889, p. 5). Whoever the *gebûren* (65, 31), *unhöveschen* (32, 2) and *hovebellen*

¹ Cf. Spervogel, *MF* 23, 13. A very appropriate and consistent figure of speech.

² Is the metrical form of 35, 17 a *valid* objection? The excellent remarks of Paul (*PBB* 8, 161-170) do not indicate, as yet, what he considers the natural limits to this freer tendency of criticism. Cf. also, Burdach, *AFDA* 9, 343. Zarncke (*PBB* 7, 597 f.) fixed the date 1201 for 21, 25, which is in the same 'tone' as 20, 31. It is not known when Walther began writing in the tone of 35, 17. 31, 33, which was formerly styled the 'Weihestrophe,' will be considered in another paper.

(32, 27) may have been,¹ among them were sharp critics of Walther's style, and possibly writers of satires like those shortly afterwards in vogue. Among these last, the 'Welt und Sitten Spiegel' (v. d. Hagen's *Germania*, 8) sinks to the level of the following: *swenne er dâ ze tische sæzze vnt gern trunch vnt æzze, sô wære daz vil gefüge, daz man für in trüge edel bluomen, loup vnt gras, daz ie der hofschære vroude was* (p. 299). *man sol den hofschær finden bi dem walde vnt bi der linden, dâ solt ein hofschær stæt sin* (p. 300). *er solt niht neisen riten in islichen chue stal. ein sov vnt ein nahtegal die singent vngelichen sanc. ein hofschær ist gar ze chranc, der sin selbes sô vergizzet, daz einen rinderinen braten izzet* (p. 301).

Wolfram von Eschenbach represents another sphere of life and thought, and is, besides, Walther's contemporary. His waggish description² of the fate of *Tesereiz der minne kranz* (Willehalm, 87, 30) is exactly in the good-humored, bantering tone which I assume Duke Leopold to have used towards Walther: *geëret si velt unde gras aldâ der minnær lac erslagen. daz velt solde zucker tragen al umb ein tagereise. der clære kurteise möht al den bien geben ir nar: sit si der süeze nement war, si möhten, wærns iht wise, in dem lufte nemen ir spise, der von dem lande kumt geflogen, dâ Tesereiz für unbetrogen sin riterliches ende nam. er was der minne ein blüender stam.*

Lachmann's explanation of 17, 25 f. furnishes a strict parallel, not only to the interpretation of 35, 17 attempted above, but also to the theory of a connection between 35, 17 and 20, 31. 'Ich glaube, ein tadler, vielleicht der dichter den das nächst folgende gesetz derb abfertigt, hatte Walthers lied vom halmmessen (65, 66) verhöhnt; etwa in dem sinne, herrn Walthers halm sei keiner bohne werth, die man dagegen schon eher besingen könnte' (141). The poet's rejoinder in dispraise of *frô Bône* is not inconsistent with 35, 17. In the latter case his existence was at stake; in the former, he had to do with a nameless critic before whom there was no need of forswearing his ideals, or even of losing his temper. But it is noticeable that the criticism suddenly develops in Walther great dexterity in poetical tillage; his Arcadian *halm* of 65, 33 is made to bring forth a hundredfold of nourishing corn, and a good straw pallet, in 17, 25.

HENRY WOOD.

¹ Cf. Uhland III 385. 459-460; Wilmanns, *Leben* 47.

² Kant (*der Humor in den Werken Wolframs*) does not notice this passage.

NOTES.

θηρ, LATIN *fera*, AND THE GREEK AND LATIN REPRESENTATIVES OF INDO-EUR. INITIAL PALATALS + *z*.

In all the more recent works treating of Greek and Latin philology we find *θηρ*, Latin *fera*, derived from an Indo-Eur. form with initial guttural, *ghēr-. So, for example, Brugmann, Grundriss I, pgs. 320, 325; Gustav Meyer, Gr. Gram.², pg. 204; Stolz, Lat. Gram.², §53. This view seems to owe its origin to the following words of J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXV, pg. 172): "*θηρ* und *ferus*, *fera* sind schon von Dobrowsky inst. p. 138 mit abulg. *zvěř* *fera* zusammengestellt; sie von einer grundform *dhvar* herzu-leiten, wie Curtius no. 314 will, verbieten die slawischen lautge-setze. Ebenso wenig ist es gestattet mit Fick II³ 167 aus aol. *φῆρ* und lat. *ferus* ein graecoitalisches *φερο-* wild zu construiren. Lit. *žvėrīs*, preuss. *swirins* acc. plur. haben als slawische lehnworte aus der discussion zu bleiben, denn das *z* des abulg. *zvěř* ist aus *dz*, der media zu *c* entstanden, wie nbulg. *dzverē* Miladin. bulg. nar pēsni No. 15 und die schreibungen der alten handschriften beweisen (zahlreiche belege in der werthvollen Abhandlung von Miklosich über die Schriftzeichen für *z* im IX bande des Rad jugosl. akad. und jetzt altslov. lautl.² 252 f.) Ebenso ist das *θ* von *θηρ* durch das folgende gemeingriechische *η* aus ursprünglichem guttural umgewandelt."

Of course the forms set up by Curtius and Fick are no longer even to be thought of. The only question is whether the initial was a guttural or palatal. The Lithuanian and Prussian forms, if not borrowed, would point conclusively to an initial palatal, and there is always a certain prejudice in favor of the genuineness of a word which occurs both in Prussian and in the earliest Lithuanian. Moreover, the Balto-Slavic family does not belong to the "labializing" group, and the presence of the *v* in *žvėrīs*, etc., seems unaccountable on the basis of an Indo-Eur. form *ghēr*-. The alleged parallels given by J. Schmidt, l. c. pg. 178, rest on too uncertain etymologies.

Now as to the main point. Do the forms of the Slavic branch

prove, as J. Schmidt maintains, that the initial was a guttural and consequently that the Baltic forms are borrowed? Not only does Slavic fail to prove this, but it actually proves the opposite.¹

I. The Bulgarian forms upon which J. Schmidt relies prove nothing. The modern Bulgarian *dzvere* is of no account, since the prefixing of a *d* sound in the pronunciation is a frequent dialectic occurrence before both *z* and *ž*. "Das *z* in einigen wörtern wird in manchem gegenden wie das poln. *dz* ausgesprochen, z. B. *zvêzda* (*dzvêzda*), *zêmù misù* (*dzêmù mîsù*), *zadnicù* (*dzadnicù*)" (Cankof, *Gram. d. Bulg. Sprache*, pg. 7; cf. also Miklosich, *Vergleich. Gram. d. Slav. Sprachen*, I², pg. 254). Only the first of these examples is a word with original guttural initial, the other two had palatal initials. Besides these cf. mod. Bulg. *dzvekna*, 'noise,' for *zvekna*, cited by Miklosich, *Etymol. Wörterbuch der Slav. Sprachen*, s. v. *zven-*.

Furthermore, the writing of the old MSS proves nothing in this case. It is true that both the Cyrillic and Glogolitic alphabets had different characters for *dz* and *z*, but even in the oldest documents they are occasionally confused, and the later the MS the more frequent are such mistakes. In the passage of Miklosich referred to by J. Schmidt (= *Vergleich. Gram. I², pg. 252*) we find *dzvěř* cited from several Cyrillic MSS, the earliest being of the twelfth or thirteenth century. But on the previous page we note that the personal pronoun *azŭ* occurs in one of the old Glogolitic MSS in the form *adzŭ*. In face of the Avestan form *azem*, J. Schmidt would scarcely consider this spelling sufficient to prove that the original form had a guttural, not palatal, and that Lithuanian *asz*, Lettic *es*, Prussian *as* are borrowed from the Slavic. Instances like *adzŭ* are not rare (cf. Leskien, *Handbuch d. altbulg. Sprache²*, §31, 3, at end), so that one cannot be too guarded in drawing conclusions from the writing of the MSS.

II. The Westslavic forms of the word directly prove that the initial was palatal, not guttural, that it is incorrect to derive *zvěř* from **guērī*. Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I, pg. 342) refers to *zvěř* as a parallel case to Old Bulgarian *cvisti*, 'to blossom,' which is derived from **kuīstī*. But the change of *k* to *c* does not occur in the Westslavic group (cf. Chechish *kvisti*, Old Polish *kwiśc*, etc.), and that the corresponding change *g*-*dz* is likewise unknown to the Westslavic languages may be seen from Chechish *hvězda*,

¹ I am obliged to Prof. Leskien for assistance and confirmation in the judgment of the Slavic forms.

Polish gwiazda, Low Sorbian gvjezda, etc. = Old Bulgarian (d)zvězda, 'star' (cf. Leskien, Handbuch, §29, 4).

But the Westslavic cognates of zvěř show a sibilant, not a guttural (cf. Czechish zvěř, Polish zwierz, Low Sorbian zvjeře), and thus exclude the possibility of deriving the word from *gwerī, Indo-Eur. *ghuēr-. The Indo-Eur. form must have been *ghuēr-, and the Baltic forms are restored to their rights.

It is evident now that we must either give up the comparison Old Bulgarian zvěř = Gr. θῆρ, Lat. fera, or explain the latter forms on a new basis. Let us first consider the Greek form. Can θῆρ be derived from Indo-Eur. ghuēr? Unfortunately the material for determining what the Greek representatives of Indo-Eur. palatals + ʷ are is very small. For gʷ- and ghʷ there are no examples, for kʷ only one or possibly two certain ones, ἱππος = Skt. áçva-s, πᾶντ- = Skt. -çvant in ça-çvant- from sa-çvant (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I, pg. 148, Griech. Gram.³, pg. 32, where, moreover, Doric πᾶμα is derived from a form *kʷā-men and Πανόχια from *kʷano-). On these forms is based the law stated by Brugmann (Grundriss, pg. 292): "Aus kʷ entstand ππ, das im anlaut zu π vereinfacht wurde." I would rather set up the following rule, based on the treatment of kʷ = Indo-Eur. guttural: *kʷ becomes ππ, initial π before o-vowels, liquids and nasal, both vocalic and consonantal, but ττ, initial τ before e- and i-vowels.*

I hold that kʷ and kʰ fell together in prehistoric Greek, as far as the *quality* of the resulting sound is concerned. They differed only in *quantity*, kʷ as two full sounds giving a double consonant, while kʰ, in which the ʷ was only a slight after-tone, produced a single consonant; cf. ἑλίκον from *e-likʰ-o-m and ἵππος from *ekʷo-s (Brugmann, Grundriss, I, pg. 315). Owing to the simplification of two initial consonants, the representatives of *initial* kʷ and kʰ would become absolutely identical. As regards the treatment of gutturals before e- and i-vowels, I hold strongly to Brugmann's treatment of this phenomenon as against that of J. Schmidt. While the latter maintains that the Greek dentalization is identical with the Aryan palatization of gutturals, both having their beginnings in Indo-Eur., Brugmann holds that the two processes have no historical connection, that the dentals are due to a special Greek treatment of the gutturals, and, moreover, of those gutturals which originally had the ʷ after-sound. That τ arose from kʰ, not from k, he justly concludes from the fact that the dental occurs only in such classes of words for which

other forms in the labializing languages prove the former existence of k^u , e. g. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}o$ beside $\pi\acute{o}-\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\tau\acute{\iota}s$ = Lat. quis, and that the dentalization does not occur in words for which other forms show the representative of simple k (not k^u), as $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta s$ = Lat. celer (cf. Grundriss, I, pg. 316).¹

Now, just as k^u becomes τ before e - and i -vowels, so may $\hat{k}u$ have become $\tau\tau$, initial τ , under the same circumstances. This hypothesis can neither be proved nor disproved by actual examples. The only certain cases of $\hat{k}u$ - $\pi\pi$, initial π , are before o -vowels or vowel nasals, $\pi\pi o$ -s from $*\hat{e}k^u o$ -s and $\pi\pi\tau$ - from $*\hat{k}u\pi$ -. To be sure, the etymology Gr. $\pi\phi\alpha\pi\acute{\iota}d\epsilon s$ = Skt. $p\acute{a}rcu$ (used in plural, meaning 'ribs'), has been proposed by Bechtel (Gött. Nachr. 1888, pg. 401) and supported by Johannson (Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Phil., 1889, pg. 366), who sets up an Indo-Eur. form $*p\acute{r}k^u\acute{i}$, but, even according to the law as usually stated, we should expect $\pi\pi$, not π , so that the comparison is too uncertain to disturb us.

Once granted the correctness of the preceding hypothesis in regard to the treatment of $\hat{k}u$ and the rest is easy. Just as g^u becomes β before o -vowels, etc., and δ before e - and i -vowels, so would $\hat{g}u$ become $\beta\beta$, initial β , and $\delta\delta$, initial δ , respectively, under the same conditions. And as kh^u (Indo-Eur. gh) becomes ϕ before o -vowels, etc., but θ before e - and i -vowels, so would $\hat{k}h^u$ (Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h^u$) become $\phi\phi$, initial ϕ , and $\theta\theta$, initial θ , respectively, and we have the explanation of $\theta\acute{\eta}p$. As Indo-Eur. $gheros$ (Skt. $h\acute{a}ras$), through the stage of prehistoric Gr. kh^ueros , becomes $\theta\acute{\epsilon}pos$, so would Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h^u\acute{e}r$, through the stage $khu\acute{e}r$, become $\theta\acute{\eta}p$.

Our next task is to explain Latin *ferus*, *fera*, on the basis of an Indo-Eur. $*\hat{g}h^u\acute{e}r$. Italic k^u (= Indo-Eur. q) and $\hat{k}u$, both initial and in the interior of a word, are alike represented in Latin by *qu*-, irrespective of the quality of the following vowel; cf. *quo*- (Indo-Eur. $*qo$ -) and *equus* (Indo-Eur. $*\hat{e}k^u o$ -s). It is held, however, that in the Italic period they were still distinct, because in Umbrian we find *ekvine*, a locative of an adj. = Lat. *equinus* (Iguvinian Tables, II A. l. 13), while forms like *pumpe* = Lat. *quomque* show that Indo-Eur. q was labialized as in Greek (cf.

¹ Our argument is in no way affected by the setting up of these non-labialized gutturals as an independent Indo-Eur. series, cf. Osthoff, M. U. V, pg. 63, note; Bezzenger in his Beiträge XVI, pg. 234 ff. For that the new series may in some cases be represented by dentals in Greek, as Bezzenger claims, is not satisfactorily proved.

Brugmann, *Grundriss*, I, pg. 322). This conclusion is, however, uncertain owing to the possibility, which Brugmann l. c. has not omitted to note, that *ekvine* may be borrowed from the Latin, as *kvestur*, to which Bücheler (*Umbrica*, pg. 127) compares it, must necessarily be. Still the question whether *k^u* and *kū* had already in the Italic period become identical or not does not affect our argument either way; for *fera*, I believe, does not occur in any of the dialects, and we may restrict ourselves to Latin.

Like *k^u* and *kū*, so may *g^u* and *gū* have become identical in Latin, and, furthermore, *χ^u* (Indo-Eur. *gh*) and *χū* (Indo-Eur. *gh*; *χ*, adopted from Brugmann's *Grundriss*, is intended merely to denote the fact that the Indo-Eur. sonant aspirates had become surd spirants in the Italic period), just as Indo-Eur. **ghormo-* (Skt. *gharmá-s*) through the stage of **χ^uormo-s*, gives Latin *formus*, so would Indo-Eur. **ghuēr-*, through **χūēr-*, give Latin *fer-a*, *fer-us*.

A certain degree of support would be given to this hypothesis that Indo-Eur. *ghū* becomes *f* in Latin, if we could show that Indo-Eur. *gh* before vowel *u* becomes *f* in Latin, and this, I think, can at least be made probable. A change of *gh* to *f* beside that of *gh-h*, was formerly held for quite a number of words, but most of these have been put aside as borrowed from the Sabine dialect, where *f* is the regular representative of *gh*.

Only *fundo* remains a stumbling-block. No one ventures to consider such a common word as of Sabine origin, and the comparison with *χέω*, Gothic *giutan*, Anglo-Saxon *geotan* (English *gut*), Skt. *√hu*, 'to pour' (a libation), Avestan *zao-prā*, 'libation,' is too striking to be given up without a struggle.

Osthoff, to be sure, denies the correctness of the etymology (*M. U.* IV, pg. 99: "Indem ich . . . verwantschaft des lat. *funderere* mit griech. *χέω*, got. *giutan* leugne, entgehe ich einerseits der lästigen zumuthung, lat. lautwandel von *gh* in *f* neben demjenigen in *h* anzuerkennen"), but Brugmann (*Grundriss*, I, pg. 294, note) retains it while acknowledging the difficulty of explaining it. Under the supposition that *gh* before *u* becomes *f*, the difficulty is removed. As another example of this change may be cited *fulvus*, which Schrader (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, pg. 168) considers to be of the same origin as *helvu-s*, which = O. H. G. *gelo*. A. S. *geolo* (English *yellow*), Skt. *hári-s*, 'bright yellow,' Avestan *zairi-š*, 'golden,' Lith. *žélti*, 'to grow green,' Old Bulg. *zelenŭ*, 'green.'

Helvu-s is from * χ el-vo-s, Indo-Eur. * \hat{g} hel-, fulvu-s from * χ ul-vo-s, Italic * χ ol-vo-s, Indo-Eur. * \hat{g} h|. The fact that fulvu-s and helvu-s are not identical in meaning in Latin is no argument against their formal relationship. "Gerade zur bezeichnung der dem bewusstsein erst allmählich aufgehenden farbenunterschiede sind der sprache lautdifferenzierungen sehr willkommen" (J. Schmidt, Vokalismus, pg. 353; the examples given to illustrate this are unfortunate, but the general truth of the statement is not to be doubted). The form folus (known only through Festus) = holus, Gr. $\chi\lambda\acute{o}\eta$, Lith. $\acute{z}ol\acute{e}$, 'herbs,' 'vegetables,' may possibly owe its f to the analogy of fulvus, but it is scarcely likely that there existed any consciousness of the connection between the two words, and so it is better, with Brugmann, Osthoff, and others, to regard folus as a Sabine word which had crept into Festus.

Let us now see if there are any facts on the negative side at variance with our law. Are there any cases in which $\hat{g}h$ before u does *not* become f. Under the instances of Lat. h for Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$ given by Brugmann (Grundriss, pg. 294) we find humu-s, but here the u is not Indo-Eur., nor even Italic, but arose in Latin by Svarabhakti, like the e in Avestan zemō (monosyllabic, as is shown by the metre) gen. sing. = Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}hm$ -os (cf. Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, II, pgs. 55, 56; Daniellson in Pauli's Altital. Studien, III, pg. 143). The u of Oskan hu[n]truis proves nothing, for in the Oskan alphabet u represents both ū and ō, and Umbrian hondra shows us that the u of hu[n]truis is for o.

It will be objected that though the u of fundo is Indo-Eur., the u of fulvu-s is not even Italic, but special Latin like the u of humus, and yet I have credited it with the power to change χ to f. True, but we can suppose that ol became ul at a period preceding that in which the Svarabhakti u in humu-s came into existence. That Italic ol = Indo-Eur. | became ul in the very earliest period of Latin, long before the general weakening of o to u, is shown by the fact that forms with o are never found (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, pg. 238). To this very period then, after the change of -ol- -ul-, but before the appearance of the Svarabhakti u in humus, belongs the action of our law— χ (Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$) becomes f before u, otherwise h. Combining this with the results of our consideration of fera, we may state as a more general law—*Indo-Eur. $\hat{g}h$, Italic $\hat{\chi}$, becomes f in early Latin when followed by u either vowel or consonant (u or ū).*

CARL D. BUCK.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Das Praesens der indogermanischen Grundsprache, von OTTO HOFFMANN.
Göttingen, 1889. 145 pp.

This monograph proposes to give a "general, comprehensive, and easily understood treatment of the forms of the Present-system in the I. E. languages, and to deduce from these the original type of the parent speech, hoping thereby to 'orient' beginners as well as specialists in the present condition of comparative grammar, and its most important results for the separate languages." This aim is commendable, for there is a lack of easily understood manuals for beginners, and the Present-system offers a very satisfactory section of grammar for introductory treatment. It may be admitted at the outset that the author's style of presentation justifies his effort after easy comprehensibility. We fear, however, that in his attempt to reach the very different groups of beginners and special philologists he has succeeded in reaching neither adequately. It was to reach the former, we presume, that Hoffmann omits all mention of his authorities, and passes over contrary opinion without a word; in setting up brand-new explanations of very unimportant points, on the other hand, he is certainly not consulting the needs of beginners. This *ipse dixit* manner does add to the comprehensibility of his treatment, but the professed scholar prefers to employ his own discrimination somewhat in deciding between the various opinions that offer.

The volume before us does present a very useful and well arranged body of material to the student. After defining the present-system and differentiating thematic and non-thematic inflection, the former is taken up in detail in the following classes:

- I. *a.* Strong root + unaccented thematic vowel.
 β. Weak root + accented thematic vowel.
- II. *a.* Strong root + jot + unaccented thematic vowel.
 β. Weak root + jot + accented thematic vowel.
- III. Weak root + inchoative suffix *skh* (*sic*).
- IV. *a.* Strong root with infixed nasal + unaccented thematic vowel.
 β. Weak root with infixed nasal + accented thematic vowel.

Paradigms of each of these classes are given for the leading members of the I. E. language family, and the original paradigms then reconstructed as far as possible. Notes follow each paradigm, explaining the variations shown by single languages from the common type. This section is concluded with tables of the reconstructed I. E. roots of the thematic class.

On p. 63 the non-thematic classes are taken up with the following subdivisions: I. The Root-Class. II. The Reduplicating Class. III. The Nasal Classes—which all alike insert the syllable *nd* for strong forms, and *n* for weak, and are thus tabulated:

III. *a*. Weak root + accented *nd'*; *β*. Weak root + accented *nd' + a*; *γ*. Weak root + accented *nd' + u*. The two last classes really form dissyllabic roots according to the Hoffmann-Fick theory, though our author nowhere speaks of them by that name.

The reconstructed paradigms seem to me very well done, barring such points as I. E. 3d sing. mid. **bherei* to be commented on, and young students can get valuable practice in reconstructing original I. E. forms. When Brugmann's volume on inflections appears the value of the book before us will be increased, for the student can then exercise an easier closet-criticism.

Two rather important points are raised by our author, as we suppose, for the first time. The first of these is a new explanation for *φέρει* and *φέρει*, p. 6; the second, a theory that thematic conjugation is older than non-thematic, that non-thematic conjugation is a secondary development from (root) aorists, i. e. that all *ω*-conjugation is original and primary, all *μ*-conjugation derived and secondary, p. 131.

The new explanation starts with the 3d sing. *φέρει* equated with Aryan **bhāre*, a form constructed from Vedic *joqe*, *toct*, *mahe*, *çaye*, *sève*, *stdve*, beside *stavate*, etc., and Zend *ipe* (sic) beside *igaitē*. Hoffmann is very unfortunate in his choice of examples; of the six Vedic examples given, *joqe*, *toct* and *sève* are not found in either Rig- or Atharva-Vedas. The only example Whitney cites in his Grammar for the *bhū*-class is *gobhe*, not given by Hoffmann, but *stdve* is cited in the Verb-Roots. *Çaye* belongs without doubt to the *ad*-class. *Mahe*, *stdve*, and *gobhe*, each of which occurs but once in R. V., are then the only unequivocal examples for the *bhū*-class. Zend *isē* is non-thematic (Bartholomae's Handbuch, §297). This is surely weak ground for setting up an I. E. **bherei* as 3d sing. mid. of thematic inflection, which in Greek became 3d sing. act., to say nothing of the strange change of voice. This point Hoffmann guards, to be sure, by equating the Lat. perf. *dedi* with Sk. *dadē*, but his position is inherently too weak for his guard to reinforce. The parallelism of the 1st and 3d sing. perf. mid. is adduced, but it weakens instead of reinforcing the position. It is merely analogy with the perf. that has affected the pres. system. The true home of this 3d sing. mid. ending *e* in Sk. is in the root-class and the infix-nasal class. Whitney's language is that these forms are "not rare" in the root-class, and "ordinary" in the infix-nasal class, and he cites for the root-class *ipe*, *duhé*, *vidé*, and *çaye* as most frequent, *cité*, *brūve*, *huvé* as more sporadic. *ipe*, Zend *isē*, is, as far as I know, the only example quotable that is common to both languages. Points cannot be made on the quantity of *i*- and *u*-vowels in Zend (Barth. Handb. §19), but *ipe* looks for all the world like a true perf. with anomalous accent, cf. Wh.² 80re; and it is from this source the perf. may have exerted its analogical influence. Forms like *vidré*, *arkhire* (Wh.² 613) show that the perf. had a corresponding effect on 3d plur. presents.

However this may be, Hoffmann is inconsistent with himself in claiming the original character of this termination and the secondary nature of non-thematic inflection where alone it makes any show whatever, save the sporadic instances noted above in the *bhū*-class.

Further, the relation of *si* : *ti* in the act. seems pretty well established for the second and third persons of the parent speech, and this supplies a strong inference for the original character of *sai* : *tai* in the mid.

So much for the *a priori* objections to this new theory, but we must further see why Hoffmann refuses the orthodox explanation of * $\phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota > \phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota > \phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ which, by taking up from $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ a new ς , became $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$. 3d sing. $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ was derived from such an analogy as $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\varsigma : \phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma = \acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon : \phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$, while by Hoffmann's theory this proportion must be just inverted. The claim is made that Homer never contracts vowels brought into hiatus by the loss of σ —always $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$, $\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\iota$, never $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, etc. This point was raised by Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth, in his dissertation on *Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen*, Göttingen, 1884, and has obtained a wide and responsible following. Before discussing the point we must eliminate all equivocal cases. Much the largest group of these is offered by words of trochaic metrical value like $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\chi\omicron\varsigma$, etc., which make $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\chi\epsilon\iota$, etc., in the oblique cases. Now it is a purely subjective theory of the rhythm of Homeric hexameters to pronounce that these must be dactyls rather than spondees. Words of this type further occur before vowels where this conjunction of two vowels makes but one short syllable in the scansion. Menrad, *de Contractionis et Synizeseos Usu Homérico*, gives fifty-three such examples. It is well known that true diphthongs like $\mu\omicron\iota$ make a short quantity in Homeric verse under these circumstances, and this is explained as the consonantizing of i to j ; Hoffmann, then, must explain such a treatment of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, etc., in the same way, e. g. in Z 127. But here is a genuine difficulty for him to meet. Homer is averse to elision of ι ; except in such true diphthongs as I have mentioned there is elision of ι in Homer only nineteen times, barring of course the cases under discussion. In Sk. *sandhi*, i is as freely consonantized after consonants before vowels as (the diphthong) e is resolved into ay in interior euphony, or into $a(y)$ in exterior: as well *aty abharam* as *pay-e* or *patata(y) iyam*, but with Homer's aversion for $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\iota}$, $\delta\tau\acute{\iota}$, etc., we must think that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, and not $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, is to be made of such verse-endings as $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$ *ἀντιόωσιν*, Z 127. The only unequivocal cases for $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$, $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$, etc., will be furnished by pyrrhic stems, or stems ending in pyrrhics when the resulting tribrachs of the oblique cases are converted into anapaests before words beginning with a pair of consonants. Until a collection is made with this object, the verdict of not proven holds against Hoffmann's position. Menrad, p. 72, furnishes eleven unequivocal examples for $-\epsilon\iota$, not $-\epsilon\iota$, in the dat. of $\epsilon\sigma$ -stems; p. 28 has seven unequivocal examples of $-\epsilon\alpha < -\epsilon\sigma\alpha$ making one long syllable (cf. further Cauer's *Odyssey XXIII*) Z 126; Φ 719, 515; P 647; χ 460; γ 91; X 299; E 734; θ 385; T 92; Ω 527; H 207; X 322; ω 534; Ω 7; λ 183³; Λ 282³. For further examples of such contraction may be cited $\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, P 573, $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, η 118, $\theta\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$, ω 394, etc. $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\eta < \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma\mu\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron < \acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron$ demand fresh explanation on this theory. I very much doubt if as many unequivocal examples of non-contracted forms can be produced by Hoffmann, under the conditions I have laid down. Is he quite ingenuous then in making such an absolute statement as the following: Griech. $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ kann nicht aus $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota = \phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota$ plus der sekundären endung $-\varsigma$ entstanden sein, da Homer zwei vokale, die ursprünglich durch sigma getrennt waren, nicht contrahierte (vergl. $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$)?

If indeed it should be proved that $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ cannot proceed from $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota < \phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota$, I think I can show that it may proceed from $\phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota < \phi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota$, for the explanation is an accentual one. Wackernagel's famous application of the thoroughgoing

enclisis of independent verbs in Sk. to the recessive accentuation of Gk. verbs will avail us here. The conditions of enclisis that grew up in Gk. absolved two syllables and three *morae* at the inflective end of the verb from accent. *φημι* and *εἰμι* fall entirely within this limit for the pres. indic., and preserve their enclitic character. In the earliest Greek stage we may assume an enclitic *φερω*, *φερεῖ*, *φερετε*, etc., but the upgrowth of this principle of enclisis gave us *φερω* : *φέρετε*. With *φερεῖ* we have a struggle between giving up complete enclisis or admitting a very simple contraction, the result was, I assume, *φερεῖ* ; at a still later stage we may conceive a paradigm *φερω*, *φερεῖς*, *φερεῖ*, but *φέρετον*, *φέρετε*, etc.

On p. 10 the author puts forth a new explanation of the Lat. subj. pres. *feram*, *feras*, etc., which he explains as I. E. *ā*-aorists. Why does not the injunctive imperfect **bheram*, **bheras*, Sk. *bharam*, *bharas* offer a better term of comparison? It seems pure wantonness to compare *vadhis*, etc., with *feras*, equating Sk. *i* = Lat. *ā*, I. E. *ā*, for both the color and the quantity of the vowels are repugnant to such an equation. This point is again brought forward on p. 131, where we reach the second of Hoffmann's larger vagaries from orthodoxy: Die meisten der *mi*-praesentia sind vom Aoriste, nur es gleich prägnanter auszudrücken, von verschiedenen aoriststämmen aus gebildet. The 'evidently composite' character of the reduplicating and nasal classes is cited in general terms as the ground for this conclusion, and now an explanation is offered for the equivalence of *feras* : *vadhis* in point of termination. 'For the proethnic speech only 2d and 3d sing. act. are extant, *āsīs* = *ēas* = *eras*, *āsīt* = *erāt*. Of these forms 47 2d and 60 3d persons are to be found in R. V. from 30 roots. A first sing. in *īm* has three occurrences from two roots. In the plural R. V. offers only two additional examples with *i*. In Homer *ἐγὴρά*, *ἀπηύρα* and *οὔρα* remain, there are scattering dialect forms, and *ἐτλα* and *ἐτλη* belong to the common dialect. The second person is, however, living, *εἶπας*, *ἔχεφας*, *ἤνεκας*, *ἐκηφας*. *εἶπα* and *εἶπε* do not belong to this type; *εἶπα* and *ἔχεφα* come from **FēFim*, **ēχēFm*, while *εἶπε* is from a thematic *εἶπον*. The final vowel seems to have been long, Sk. *i*, *ἀπεύρα*, δ 646, and *κατεγὴρά*, ι 510 in Homer; *οὔρα* is an exception.'

On this slender basis the author would reconstruct for I. E. a new aorist system differing from the *a*-aorist as described by Wh.² 846 fg. An examination of the Homeric forms will show how slight is the help the Greek affords. *ἀπηύρα* δ 646 is certainly a contracted impf. to correspond with 1st pers. *ἀπηύρων*. If Hom. did not always use *γηράσκω*, not *γηράω*, *κατεγὴρά* ι 510 would have the same explanation: *καταγηράω* does appear as early as the Ionic of Herodotus. *οὔρα* is certainly a better testimony to *ā* than *κατεγὴρά* to *ā*. The evidence is altogether insufficient for setting up a 3d sing. aor. ending *-*āt* = Sk. *it*.

It is scarcely necessary to point to *ἔβα*, *ἔβη* to explain *ἐτλα*, *ἐτλη*. **FēFim* > *εἶπα*, **ēχēFm* > *εἶπας*, correspond in every respect with Sk. *dvidam*, *avidas*, and *εἶπε* may be due to the analogy of the perf. endings -*a*, -*as*, -*e*. For the Sk. examples cited the stem-form too exactly agrees with that of the *iā*-aorist, speaking in the large, to be separated from it; cf. Wh.² 899-901.

'The reduplicating and root classes are derived from root aorists gone over into *μi*-inflection. Beside *dadāti* is *dāti* (5 times in R. V.) from the aor. *adāt* ;

eti is associated with thematic *ayate*, and there is a *bharte* to *bharate*, the thematic types being the older.'

The position that reduplicating and nasal class verbs are of secondary origin seems logical enough on *a priori* grounds, but it is hard to see how the aorists would help themselves to nasal and reduplicating affixes in passing over to a present system. Reduplicated aorists exist, to be sure, but in Sk. the method of reduplication is very unlike that of present stems.

Many difficulties lie in the way of this view for the root class. In all members of the I. E. family the trend is away from non-thematic to thematic inflection. In Sk. *piḥati*, *tiṣṭhati*, *jighrati*, and *sidati*, *dadati* and *dadhati* are all transfers from the reduplicating to the thematic class.

If we compare the lists in Whitney's Verb-Roots we see how poor a basis is afforded for Hoffmann's view. The root *kr* for the earlier language makes the very best showing that can be found for his theory. This root has developed only three forms of root-present in R. V., *kṛthās*, *kṛtha*, *kṛsé*. In A. V. the only occurrence is *kdr̥qi*; *√gam* has only *gathā* in R. V.; in Rig- and Atharva-Vedas I *√ci* forms *ceṭi*; *√jan* gives *janiṣva* (?); *√ji* gives *jēqi* and *jitam*; *√juṣ* gives *jōqi*; *√dā* gives *dāti* and *dātu*; *√dhā* gives *dhāti* (3); I *√pā* gives *pānti* (1), *pāthās* (1); *√bhṛ* gives *bharti* (2); *√yam* gives *yānsi*; *√yuj* gives *yujé*, *yujmahe*, *yujata*, *yuksud*; *√yudh* gives *yótsi*; *√vāh* gives a large complement of forms, but its root aor. is as late as Sūtra and of an altogether different stem formation; *√vrt* gives *vartti* (1); *√gru* gives *grōqi*; *√sah* gives *sakqi*, *sākva*, *sāksva*; *√hū* gives *hōma*, *hūmdhe*; and *√hr̥* gives *harne* (1), though its aor. is as late as Brāhmaṇa, as is the case with aor. of *√bhṛ*. These are the only examples of root-presents in the early language where one can see any trace of aor. influence. Of the root-presents that prevail throughout the language *√ad* and *√i* give the most support to Hoffmann's theory, and root-aorists to these bases appear late, to *√ad* in Br., to *√i* as late as Epic. The truth is that there is no intrinsic difference between the impfs. to root-presents, and root-aorists. *dbhedam* (R.-A.); *ddveṣam* (R. I.), *abhet*: *ddvet*, *dmok*: *adhok*, *arudhma*: *dduhma*, *aṣvitan*: *dlihan* are perfect parallels in formation, and we might easily set up counter to Hoffmann's theory the explanation of root-aorists as imperfects of the root-class, if we chose to quibble about names. Indeed, these forms can be distinguished only by a syntactical test which admits of being made in R. V. between the 'true-perfect' value of the aor. and the merely past signification of the impf., and this test our author should have made before setting up his theory.

Further, many Vedic roots appear as root-presents only, disappearing in the later language altogether. What is the explanation of such sporadic forms? Plainly this, it seems to me. They are survivals, and of a particularly antique nature. The explanation from analogy cannot be duly applied, for the analogies all lead to the devouring thematic type. It must be remembered that analogy is an economy of thought, as phonetic law is an economy of utterance, and in the forms under discussion analogy could only lead, speaking in the large, to the dead level of thematic inflection.

The accentual phenomena accompanying strong and weak stems in the root-present seem to be of a more archaic nature than the set accent of the thematic types.

If non-thematic inflection is of secondary origin, the next shift of the

kaleidoscope will be to that theory of dissyllabic roots of which Fick is so enthusiastic an advocate. We shall no longer write *q̄bher*, but *q̄bheru/σ*—as Milton said that 'new presbyter is but old priest writ large.'

On p. 78 we have an investigation of the so-called Fick's law that I. E. *i* appears in Greek as *i* if the accent originally followed, but as *j* when it preceded. This is extended by Hoffmann with apparent correctness to such a statement as the following: 'I. E. *i* appears as *j* in Gk. if the accent directly preceded, but as *i* if the accent had any other position.' Germanists will be interested to see how this tallies with Verner's law.

Some minor corrections remain to be made: p. 10, *arcā* cited as the only 1st sing. subj. of the shorter form in the *tud*-class should be followed by *madā* (Wh.³ 737). P. 43 we have an I. E. *sido* posited from Sk. *sīdati*, Lat. *sido*. *izō* is explained from **sīdjo*. The old explanation by reduplication explains all the forms. *si-sed* > *si-sd* > *sīd*-, but in Gk. *si-sd* > *i*z: Dor. *isō*-, is here important, for *sīd*z- would give Dor. *lōd*-, cf. Brug. Gr. Gram.² §41 in the Handbuch. *bhē-n-dho*, p. 58, is given to the infix-nasal class, but there is no evidence for anything but *bhēndho*. Possibly *spē-n-do* is in the same case. We have, to be sure, *σφδ-avós* beside *σφενδó-vη*, and *σφδ-ρός* is in proper *ablaut* relations with it, but there is a variant reading *σφαδavós* (condemned by Aristarchus) for Homer which looks to a **σφῆδavós*, and we might suspect in *σφδavós* a popular etymology from *σφενδó-vη*. *σφδ-ρός* is easy of explanation from **σφαδ-ρος* as a labialization.

On p. 73 we have a queer statement *à propos* of Sk. *edhi* < as **dhi* (sic): Die Erscheinung, dass von einem klingenden consonanten nur *i* übrig bleibt ist im indischen perfectum durchgehend: *sēdimá* < *sais* **dīmá* < *sas* **dīmá*, *pēcimá* < *paip* **cēmá* < *pap* **cīmá*. To avoid the explanation by analogy—to which he resorts readily enough in support of his favorite thesis of aoristically derived presents—Hoffmann ignores the fundamental distinction between surd and sonant, actually allowing a surd to give compensatory lengthening—for that is how the above statement results.

In the list of aorists in *-it*, on p. 132, *barhit* and *varhit* are given as separate words! *codis*, *dhvanit*, *dhāyis* (?), *stambhit* and *sedhis* are omitted, while *yāsīt* is given, in reality a *-siq*-aorist.

On p. 134 Hoffmann makes an explanation of *brdvīmi*, *tāvīti*, *cvdsiti*, etc., that I am glad to accept, when he accounts for the stem as derived from aorists in *-is*, *-it*. I fully agree with him also in explaining *āsīs*, *āsīt*, *abravis*, *abravit* as aorists.

Finally, there occurs on p. 100 a sentence that M. Victor Henry, who reviewed this book in the *Revue Critique*, 2-9, Sept. 1889, felt impelled to criticise sharply in the interest of scientific spirit and method: "*Δίδοται*," writes our author, "geht auf älteres **δίδοται* zurück: das *-σ* der endung wurde wohl deshalb nachträglich wieder eingefügt, weil man eine contraction von **δίδοται* vermeiden wollte." Whereupon M. Henry remarks: "Je n'insiste pas; qui de nous n'a à se reprocher d'avoir, au moins une fois en sa vie, écrit une énormité pareille?"

Hoffmann's views are sure to produce discussion whatever the final verdict may be in regard to them. We must wait with interest to hear what such masters as Brugmann, de Saussure, and Ascoli think of his original contribution to the points he has discussed.

EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY.

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY. Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vol. I, 1890. Boston, Ginn & Company.

A prefatory note states that "these studies are published by authority of Harvard University, and will be contributed chiefly by its instructors and graduates, although contributions from other sources will not necessarily be excluded. The publication is supported by a fund of \$6000, generously subscribed by the class of 1856. A volume of about 200 pages will be issued yearly."

Vol. I contains the following articles: The Fauces of the Roman House, J. B. Greenough (cut). Opinions of previous writers concerning the position of the fauces are mentioned, after which Vitruvius, VI 1-4, is discussed in connection with the use of the word fauces by other authors. The result of the investigation is to show that the fauces were the entrance to the atrium. The same conclusion was reached by Ivanhoff, *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1859, p. 82, and adopted by von Rohden, *Baumeister, Denkmäler*, p. 1366.

De Ignis Eliciendi Modis apud Antiquos, M. H. Morgan. This article was written for the purpose of obtaining the degree of Ph. D. The ancients kindled fires from fires already burning whenever that was possible. When a new fire had to be started various means were employed. The most primitive method is by rubbing two sticks together, but this was early superseded by the practice of twirling a stick (*πυρρῆιον*, *ignitabulum*, *igniarius*) in a hole made in a board or other piece of wood. This could be twirled by rubbing it alternately with the hands or by twisting a cord about it and pulling the ends of the cord alternately. The latter method makes two persons necessary. To obviate this difficulty the ends of the string were fastened to the ends of a bow-shaped stick, which could be moved back and forth with one hand, thus pulling the ends of the cord alternately. This instrument was the *ἀρίς*. The word *στροφέας* in Hesych. and the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius is a mistake for *τοπέας*, which is equivalent to *τρίπανον* or *πυρρῆιον*. The best material for the *πυρρῆιον* was the laurel or a wild vine, for the wood in which the *πυρρῆιον* was turned (*ἐσχάρα*, *tabula*) the ivy. The first mention of a spark struck from two stones is found in Soph. Phil. 295. This method remained in use longer than any other. The stones best fitted for this purpose were flint and pyrites, a copper ore. The use of iron for striking a spark from stone is first mentioned by Lucretius, 6, 162, and seems not to have been common. The spark was caught in sulphur, dry fungi, leaves or shavings. The reed (*νάρθηξ*, *ferula*) was used, not as fuel, but for the purpose of covering and preserving live coals. The use of glass to kindle fire by the rays of the sun is mentioned by Aristophanes (Nub. 764 sqq.), but was evidently unusual in his time. The shape recommended by Pliny is that of a ball. Crystal was not known in early times, but Pliny mentions the use of a crystal ball in cautery, and later writers also speak of its use as a burning-glass. Fire was also kindled by reflection of the sun's rays from a concave mirror. This method is mentioned by Euclid, Plutarch and Pliny. The mirrors were of metal, not glass. A combination of plane mirrors can be made to cause fire, but the story that Archimedes set fire to the ships of Marcellus by such means is rejected as false. The story may be founded upon experiments which Archimedes may have recorded. On the

first of March of every year the vestal virgins kindled anew the sacred fire. This they did by friction. The passage in Plutarch, v. Num. IX, which seems to contradict this statement, refers to Greek, not to Roman matters, and is interpolated besides. Julian, Orat. ad Solem regem, p. 155 A, refers probably to Byzantine affairs. The instrument mentioned in the rejected passage in Plutarch, by which the sun's rays kindled a fire, was a prism or cube from which part of the upper surface was cut out in a parabolic curve so as to concentrate the sun's rays by reflection.

On the Origin of the Construction of *οὐ μή* with the Subjunctive and the Future Indicative, W. W. Goodwin. The independent subjunctive with *μή* was used as "an expression of apprehension with desire to avert its object . . . The aorist subjunctive is the most common form here, the present being less frequent." The subjunctive with *οὐ μή* is the negative of the subjunctive with *μή*. "This form of future denial next admitted the future indicative in the same sense as the subjunctive. The second person singular of this future with *οὐ μή* was used by the dramatists as a prohibition, without abandoning the sense which the future can always have in both positive and negative commands. In these prohibitions the future indicative, in which they had their origin, is generally used; but the subjunctive occasionally occurs, being analogous to the ordinary aorist subjunctive with *μή* in prohibitions."

On some Disputed Points in the Construction of *ἔδει*, *χρῆν*, etc., with the Infinitive, W. W. Goodwin. It is generally laid down as an absolute rule that when *ἔδει* (*χρῆν*, etc.) is used without *ἄν* with the infinitive, the opposite of the infinitive is always implied, and that when *ἄν* is used, the opposite of the verbs of necessity (obligation, etc.) is implied, e. g. that with *ἔδει τοῦτο γίνεσθαι* we must understand *ἀλλ' οὐ γίγνεται*, with *ἔδει ἄν τοῦτο γίνεσθαι* we must understand *ἀλλ' οὐ δεῖ*. This does not cover all cases, e. g. Hdt. I 39 εἰ ὑπὸ δδόντος εἶπε τελευτήσῃν με, *χρῆν δὲ σε ποιεῖν τὰ ποιεῖς*, and concessive sentences, in which the statement precludes the contrary of the apodosis, as Hdt. VII 56, Isoc. XVIII 19. In some concessive sentences the action of the infinitive is denied, notwithstanding the concessive protasis, e. g. Soph. O. T. 255, Thuc. I 38. The following rules cover all cases: 1. "The form without *ἄν* is used when the infinitive is the principal word, on which the chief force of the expression falls, while the leading verb is an auxiliary which we can express by *ought*, *might*, *could*, or by an adverb. 2. On the other hand, when the chief force falls on the necessity, propriety, or possibility of the act, and not on the act itself, the leading verb has *ἄν*, like any other imperfect in a similar apodosis." In all examples of *ἔδει ἄν* "we find *ἔδει ἄν* in its meaning *there would be* (or *would have been*) *need*, whereas in the form without *ἄν* we generally have *ἔδει* in the sense of *ought*, expressing *obligation* and not *necessity*." *ἔδει ἄν* differs from *ἔδει* without *ἄν* in meaning as well as in balance of emphasis. *ἐξῆν ἄν* differs from *ἐξῆν* only in the latter respect. In opposition to La Roche, the integrity of two passages (Dem. XVIII 195, Lys. XII 32) in which *χρῆν ἄν* occurs is maintained. In the use of *licebat*, *debebat*, etc. (= *ἐξῆν*, *χρῆν*, etc.), and *liceret*, *deberet* (= *ἐξῆν ἄν*, *χρῆν ἄν*), the Latin follows the same principle as the Greek. But when these expressions refer to past time, the Latin uses *debuit* or *debuerat* in the sense of *χρῆν*, *debuisset* in that of *χρῆν ἄν*.

Notes on Quintilian, G. M. Lane. The original long quantity of the *o* of

the genitive plural ending *-om* is shown (1) by the dropping of the final *m* on coins struck before the Punic war; (2) by the apex occurring in the inscription of Nuceria, IRN. 2096; CIL. X, n. 1081: DVVMVIRATVS, which proves the length of the *u* in this genitive. Quintilian, I 6, 18, mistakes the genitives plural *nummum* and *deum* for misused accusatives singular, showing that in his day the long *ō* or *ū* was forgotten. Quintilian, I 4, 27, gives *lectum* as a word which may be a participium or an appellatio. But *lēctum*, 'bed,' has a short *ē*, while *lēctum*, 'picked,' has a long *ē*. Read, therefore, *tectum*. The passage I 4, 16, which the last editors, Halm and Meister, read thus: quid o atque u permūtata inuicem? ut 'Hecoba' et '†notrix,' 'Culcides' et 'Pulixena' scriberentur, is emended by reading 'nutrix Culcidis.' The nurse of Medea is well known.

Some Latin Etymologies, J. B. Greenough. The words *reciprocus*, *proximus*, *procus* (in the sense of *foremost man*), *proceres*, *procax*, *Proculus*, *procul*, are all derived from †*procus* = *pro* + *cus*. Of these, *reciprocus* is a compound of †*recus* and †*procus*, meaning *back and forth*. From †*recus* come also *recipero* and *recens*. The fundamental meaning of *improbus* has not been clearly understood. *Probus* is *pro* + *bus*, the use of *pro* being analogous to that of *super* in *superbus*. *Probus* appears to have been a mercantile word, meaning *A1* or *first-class*. Then *improbus* means *not first-class, second rate*, etc. *Rudimentum* is derived from *rudis*, *foil* or *stick*, through a real or supposed verb *rudio*, *fence with the foil*. *Rudimentum* is then *foil-practice*, the first practice of the soldier, hence first attempts generally. From *rudis* an adjective *erudis* would mean *out of the foil*, and from this *erudio* naturally means *train to the point of graduation from mere foil-practice*. *Desidero* is derived from an adjective †*desides* (or *desider*). The original meaning of *sidus* was probably *place*. Then †*desider* or the phrase *de sidere* would mean *out of place*, and *desidero* would mean *mark or find out of place* after a battle or military casualty. This military sense of the word is common. *Considero* may have had a similar origin from an adjective †*consides* (or *-er*). *Elementum* is derived from LMN, *el*, *em*, *en*. *Praemium* is derived from *prae* and *emo* (in its earlier sense of *take*) and means 'the part of the booty taken out beforehand' as a reward for merit, then *reward* generally. *Deliciae* and *delicatus* point to *delicus* and †*delico*. Varro uses *delicus* to mean a young weaned pig. The word, if applied to lambs or kids, might easily mean *pet*, from which †*delico* with its participle *delicatus*; *deliciae* is then an abstract noun used, however, ordinarily as a concrete. *Provincia* is derived from *pro* and *vinco* through a †*provincus*. A consul engaged in extending the Roman dominion would be *provincus*, and his sphere of operations his *provincia*. From this meaning the others are developed.

On Egregium Publicum (Tac. Ann. III 70, 4), C. L. Smith. In the words "Capito insignitior fama fuit quod humani divinique iuris sciens egregium publicum et bonas artes dehonestavisset," Capito's eminence as a lawyer must be expressed as one of the objects of *dehonestavisset*. This relation is not contained in the words as they stand. For *egregium publicum* read *egregium publice locum*.

On the use of the Perfect Infinitive in Latin with the Force of the Present, A. A. Howard. "In early Latin the perfect infinitive with its proper significance was made to depend on the verb *nolo* or *uolo* in prohibitions; but since

the verb of wishing contained the idea of futurity, the whole clause acquired the force of a future perfect expression. Later writers, and especially the poets, transferred this use to negative clauses not prohibitive, containing verbs of wishing, and secondly to clauses containing verbs like *laboro*, *amo*, and *timeo*, 'Verba der Willensrichtung.' Since these verbs contain the idea of futurity, the present infinitive joined with them has the force of a future, the perfect infinitive the force of a future perfect. The tendency of the Latin writers to use the future perfect for the future, through an overstrained desire to be exact, led them in these clauses to use the perfect infinitive instead of the present. The poets, and especially the elegiac poets, took advantage of the opportunity thus offered and transferred the use to other constructions which did not contain a verb of wishing. The reasons for this were two: first, the present infinitive of a large number of verbs which they wished to use, could not, on account of metrical difficulties, be used in their verse, or could be used only under certain restrictions; second, the perfect infinitive of these verbs was peculiarly adapted to the necessities of the last half of pentameter verse. The infinitive in this use seemed to have the force of an aorist infinitive in Greek, and, in course of time, came to be used by the poets even where the metre admitted the use of the present infinitive."

Plutarch *περὶ εὐθυίας*, H. N. Fowler. In this little treatise Plutarch does not, as R. Hirzel thinks, follow Panaetius for the most part, but derives his philosophical doctrines, as well as his anecdotes and quotations, chiefly from common-place books or anthologies, which he supplements by the results of his own reading.

Vitruviana, G. M. Richardson. The following peculiarities in Vitruvius' use of words are noticed: The limitative use of the preposition *ab* (I 1, 17); the descriptive use of *cum*, the preposition with its noun having the force of an adjective or adverb (I 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, III 1, 4); *aliter* repeated with *atque* as its connective (I 1, 7); *nec* strengthened by a following negative (I 1, 14); *oppido* followed by *quam* (I 3, 7, VII Praef. 14, VIII 3, 11, IX (2) 2); *quemadmodum* used as a relative to introduce a clause with or without a corresponding adverb, or to introduce an illustrative clause (in the sense "for example"), or to introduce a single word with the ellipsis of the verbal idea, and lastly *quemadmodum* as an interrogative (numerous examples); the repetition in the apodosis of the word which in the protasis forms the conditional particle (*sic*, *si*, I 2, 7); the use of *ut* in wishes, etc. (I 1, 3, VIII 7, 1); the indicative in indirect questions (II 6, 4, II 8, 18, II 9, 17, etc.); the infinitive as predicate after *esse* (II 9, 15); *putare*, in the sense of "intend" with complementary infinitive (II 1, 18).

The Social and Domestic Position of Women in Aristophanes, H. W. Haley. Women were held in low estimation both by men and by themselves. Perhaps the plays of Euripides helped to form this unfavorable estimate. Women were not the equals and confidants of their husbands. They were not allowed to appear in public, but were confined to the house, though married women had more liberty than the unmarried, and even the unmarried had considerable liberty in connection with religious festivals, marriage, and burial. Women appear to have been present at the performance of tragedies, but not of comedies. The chief domestic duties of women were the preparation of wool, spinning, weaving, etc. Cooking was usually done by slaves, and in wealthy

families the care of children was entrusted to slaves. Women learned the elements of letters, besides singing and dancing. For other information they depended upon conversation with their husbands and male relatives.

Notes. F. D. Allen. *ψαῖος*, attributed to Alcman in Schol. A, Iliad M 137, is miswritten for *φαῖος* = *φάος*. In CIL. I 199, *faenisiceī* is an error of the graver for *faenisicie*, the ablative of a † *faenisicies*, the counterpart of *faenisicia*. In Schol. Arist. Ran. 13, for *φορτικενομένου* read *φορτακενομένου*, and in Suidas s. v. *Λύκις* read *ἐφορτακέυετο* for *ἐφορτικέυετο*. In the Heracleian tables, I 105 fig. *ἀρτύω* is explained as referring to partnership, and translated 'make a compact' or 'go shares.' Aristophanes, Frogs 179 fig. are arranged in this order: 179, 181, 182, 183, 180, 184, the words in 181, *τοῦτ' ἵ τί ἐστι*, being given to Dionysos, and *ὥπ, παραβαλοῦ* (180) to Xanthias. In Herod. VI 57, the words *τρίτην δὲ τὴν ἑωντῶν* are regarded as an interpolation.—J. B. G. Martial V 78, v. 32 is explained as a question. The guest is asked who the fourth person at the banquet shall be.—G. M. L. *Ellum* is shown to be formed from *em illum*; cf. A. Spengel on Ter. Andria, 855.—A general index and an index of citations close the volume.

H. N. F.

Gudrun, a Mediaeval Epic, translated from the Middle-High-German by Mary Pickering Nichols. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1889. xv and 363 pp. Price \$2.50.

In the translation of a classical poem like Gudrun one of at least three methods may be pursued: (1) a literal prose rendering of the original, a "half-truth," may be given, with greatest success, perhaps, "in words that are old and plain," as in the case of the Butcher-Lang Odyssey, or the Lang-Leaf-Meyers Iliad; (2) the translator may reproduce the essential content and spirit, "fairly and honestly give the sense" in a more modern form of verse, as the Earl of Derby did in his Iliad, or Birch in his Nibelungenlied; (3) the essential content and spirit and also the original *verse-form* may be reproduced in a modern tongue, as in the case of Aubertin's Lusiads and Miss Nichols' Gudrun, the work under review. This last is certainly the ideal mode of rendering an ancient epic; for thus not only the flavor and color, but also the rhythmic effect of the original can be transmitted to the modern reader. Compare the following strophe (389) of the original, describing the effect of the Orphean strains of Horant's song, and the translation by Miss Nichols:

Diu tier in dem walde	ir weide liezen stên
die wîrme, die dâ solden	in dem grase gên
die vische, die dâ solden	in dem wâge vliezen,
die liezen ir geverte.	jâ kunde er sîner fuoge
	wol geniezen.

Translation:

The wild beasts in the forest	let their pasture grow;
The little worms that creeping	through grass are wont to go,
The fishes, too, that ever	amidst the waves were swimming,
All now stopped to listen;	the singer's heart with pride
	was overbrimming.

Thus it will be observed that the Gudrun strophe:

u l u l u l u	u l u l u l
u l u l u l u	u l u l u l
u l u l u l u	u l u l u l u
u l u l u l u	u l u l u l u l u l u

is faithfully preserved. To be sure, the reader, if acquainted only with modern verse-forms, may find this ancient measure a trifle puzzling at the first glance, but will need to read only a few verses in order to be charmed by the magic power of the rhythm and the epic effect of the last verse of the strophe. To one interested in the psychology of rhythmic forms this fourth verse furnishes a suggestive subject for experiment.

To the student of Gudrun, however, two features of the form of Miss Nichols' translation seem open to criticism. It is well known that the Gudrun epic, as we have it, is interspersed with frequent Nibelungen strophes. Instead of rendering these into the strophic form of the original, the translator has turned all the Nibelungen strophes into Gudrun strophes. Simrock's N. H. German translation, on the contrary, retains the form of the Nibelungen strophes. The second vulnerable point in the form of the translation is its abundance of imperfect rhymes. This is the more striking because the original is almost faultless in its rhymes. Examples are: (masculine) *maid: head; arms: warms; fair: near; far: spare; known: soon; (a)bide: did; come: home; (feminine) merry: weary; fitted: greeted; listen: hasten; heareth: beareth; dealing: dwelling; mourning: turning*. As will be readily marked, many of these are only assonance. These weaknesses in the strophic structure detract greatly from the faithfulness of the translation, so true in other respects.

Let us examine the rendering of the content of the poem. The best criterion of a masterly translation of an ancient poem is that it transfer the reader into the antique atmosphere of the original without forcing upon him violent forms of speech, a fault which some otherwise well equipped translators have not avoided. In this respect the translator of Gudrun is remarkably successful. Occasional archaisms are not of such a character as to call for more than a passing notice; cf. "'Twould glad me greatly," 385, 4, and "This is true, I weet," 207, 2.

As might be expected from the very nature of the difficulty of adapting the Gudrun verse to English expression, many infelicitous renderings are to be found. Cf. the following: Str. 68, 2-3,

iedoch het ez besunder darumbe grôze nôt,
wan ez der alde grife den slen jungen truoc.

But none the less he *later* a life of sadness led,
After the harsh old griffin back to his nestlings bore him.

Cf. Simrock's translation of this strophe. So strophe 79, 4; 84, 4; 1041, 4; 1042, 4 and others.

Miss Nichols, as she states in the preface, has followed the text of Bartsch's edition. This is true not only of the text, but of the notes as well. The translation might have been improved in certain places by adopting suggestions of other editors; for example, in strophe 21, by rendering *das kreflige*

gnot, verse 1, as in apposition with *huobe* (cf. Symons' ed., notes to this passage). So also in strophe 116, verse 2, Symons refers the word *ungewohnheite* ("wondrous dwelling," Nichols) not to their "ungewohnte Umgebung" (Bartsch), but to "das ungewohnte tragen fremder Kleider" (cf. also C. Hofmann, s. 226 f.) So other passages might be cited where preferable rendering could have been adopted; cf. Symons' notes on str. 97, 4; 153, 2; 1147, 1 and others. Martin and Symons seem to have been seldom consulted in the translation.

Cases of redundant filling to complete the measure are frequent; cf. str. 424, 4; 548, 3-4; 637, 4.

Names of persons have been wisely retained in their original form, as Wate, Horant, Sigeband, Ute and others; but geographical names are treated more freely. In some cases unjustifiable irregularities have crept in. In str. 204, 1 *Danelande*, renders correctly the original *Tenelant*, so str. 242, 3 *Denmark*, *Tenemarke*; but why *Daneland* for *Tenemarke*, str. 206, 1; 1612, 4, is not apparent.

But these matters of detail do not seriously impair the real value of the translation. The translator has done her work with a master-hand, and added a long neglected monument of Middle-High-German epic song to the list of classical English translations. Miss Nichols' Gudrun deserves a place by the side of Aubertin's *Lusiads* and Longfellow's and Dean Plumptre's *Divina Comœdia*. The *Nibelungenlied* has not yet found an English translator so competent.

M. D. LEARNED.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY. Part V, *Cast-Clivy*. Oxford, At The Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1889.

Part V of the New English Dictionary should have been noticed before in this Journal. It is, as the preceding parts have been, full of information and interest. Dr. Murray tells us that it contains 8371 words. This is fewer than any part has contained except the first (8365). A rough calculation makes the average of the five parts about 8700 each, which would give about 208,000 words for the whole work, or deducting 25 per cent for obsolete words, the present English vocabulary may be estimated at about 156,000 words. It is likely to be rather more than less than this. But, as the large majority of these words are unknown to literature, this method of counting fails to give an adequate idea of the resources of the language. Perhaps some statistician with a plenty of leisure may, by suitable deductions, make this calculation for us.

Every page shows the labor that has been expended upon this unrivalled work. Take the first word *Cast*, and it fills, as both noun and verb, over twenty columns. *Church* alone fills ten columns, and with its compounds about ten more.

Great attention has been paid to securing etymological accuracy, as the exhaustive discussion of *Church* shows. Dr. Murray gives his adhesion to the view that it is derived from the Greek *κυριακόν* (sc. *δῶμα*, or the like), "which occurs, from the third century at least, used substantively = 'house of the Lord,' as a name of the Christian house of worship." He says further that "the

use of *κρυιακή* in Greek appears too late to affect the question." *Cirice, circe*, are regarded as the oldest English forms, not *cyrice*, which is a later variant, and these correspond to a West Germanic *kirika*. "Although the notion has been advanced that all the continental forms originated in the O. E., in connexion with the early missionary labors of Englishmen in Germany, this is philologically untenable, and the word is held on good grounds to be common W. Ger., and to go back at least to the fourth or fifth century." The whole discussion, which fills nearly two columns, is an interesting one and will well repay perusal. The earliest example of the use of the word in English writing is taken from the *Laws of King Wihtraed*, A. D. 696, but it doubtless goes back to the coming of St. Augustine, one hundred years earlier.

It is difficult to make selections in order to give an idea of the fullness of the work, but, as a point of present interest, it may be mentioned that Dr. Murray is no stickler for particular forms of spelling. He gives both *centre* and *center*, though plainly preferring the former, and says: "The prevalent spelling from sixteenth to eighteenth century was *center*, in Shakspeare, Milton, Boyle, Pope, Addison, etc.; so the early dictionaries, Cotgr. ('*centre*, F., a *center*'), Cockeram, Phillips, Kersey, and all the thirty editions of Bailey 1721-1802; but the technical volume of Bailey (Vol. II) 1727-31, and the folio 1730-36, have *centre*; 'an interleaved copy of the folio of 1730 was the foundation of Johnson's Dictionary,' which followed it in spelling *centre*; this has been generally adopted in Great Britain, while *center* is the prevalent spelling in the United States." The last statement may be true, and if so, it is due to the influence of Noah Webster in the northern section of the United States, but the majority of educated persons in this latitude spell *centre*. It is, however, a matter of small consequence, and this quotation shows, what has been asserted before, that the forms of modern English spelling are due chiefly to Dr. Johnson, who, unfortunately, did not take advantage of his opportunity to correct some of the bad spelling of his time.

It is interesting to note in respect to another point that *chock-full* is the better substantiated form, although *choke-full* is also given. Dr. Murray says: "The American lexicographers have *chock-full* as the standard form with *choke-full* as a cross-reference; and this appears to agree with literary usage in U. S. *Choke-full* appears to be rather the more frequent in literary use in England; but *chock-full* is almost universal in spoken use; *chuck-full*, in literary use before and after 1800, is now only dialectal." After discussing the derivation, which is unsettled, and the forms in the English dialect glossaries, he concludes, "*Choke-full* appears to have no local status, . . . being thus merely a book-spelling founded upon a conjectural derivation." *Chuck-full*, I may add, is illiterate usage here.

Under U. S. colloquialisms we find Bret Harte (1870) and Mark Twain (1872) as authorities for *To hand (pass) in one's checks*, but the phrases are much older than either of those dates.

It is strange that the *Slang Dictionary* (1873) is the earliest authority for *chips* = money, and no example is found of the present fashionable use of *chips* in card-playing, although the word is defined as "a counter used in games of chance." Bret Harte (1870) is again the earliest authority for *chip in* in the sense of interrupting a conversation, and this is the only use of that term men-

tioned. Among the phrases in which *chip* occurs I fail to find *knock a chip off one's head*, but perhaps English boys are not as familiar with the custom as American. It is interesting to note that Milton uses *chip of the old block*, and Bishop Sanderson has *chip of the same block*, in a metaphorical sense.

We have a most interesting discussion of the two verbs *cleave*, to split, and *cleave*, to cling to, the former being originally a strong *u*-verb, and the latter a strong *i*-verb and also weak. Dr. Murray well says: "From the fourteenth century the inflexional forms of this verb [CLEAVE¹] have tended to run together with those of CLEAVE², 'to stick.' Though the latter was originally *clive*, it had also the variants *cleove*, *clève*, the latter of which at length prevailed; the two verbs having thus become identical in the present stem were naturally confused in their other inflexions." If the forms *cleve* and *clive*, which existed in the fourteenth century, could have been kept separate, this confusion might possibly have been avoided, but in language there is no place for the "might have been." We have to take it as it is, and try to explain the apparently arbitrary variations as best we can by known phonetic laws.

To the examples of *Clergy* in the sense of "learning, scholarship, science," I may add the following from Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, II 82, 10, which may come in well between the example from the *Metrical Homilies* (1325) and that from the *York Mysteries* (1440):

"In the cronique as I finde
Cham, whos labour is yet in minde,
Was he, which first the letters fonde
And wrote in Hebreu with his honde,
Of natural philosophy
He found first also the *clergy*."

This is a plain statement, according to Gower, that Ham not only invented the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, but discovered also the science of natural philosophy. (One cannot read a page of Gower without wishing that some English scholar who has access to the MSS would undertake a revision of Pauli's text, but I suppose it will be left for the inevitable German to do.) The last example of this use of *clergy* is from a dictionary of 1690 in the proverb: "An ounce of mother-wit is worth a pound of clergy," though Sydney Smith (1822) also quotes the proverb. But one cannot tell where to stop in turning over the leaves of this great dictionary. I can only again express the hope that it may be found practicable, by increasing the editorial staff, to issue the several parts at shorter intervals.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

A History of Elizabethan Literature. By GEORGE SAINTSBURY. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1887.

A History of Eighteenth Century Literature (1660-1780). By EDMUND GOSSE, M. A. London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1889.

Although not strictly "philological," the importance of the two volumes above mentioned may justify a brief notice in this Journal. An advertisement prefixed to the former work states that it "is intended to form the second

volume of a History of English Literature, divided into four main periods, each of which is entrusted to a writer who has made that period his particular study. The volume on the Earliest Period of English Literature has been undertaken by Mr. STOPFORD BROOKE, the volume dealing with the Literature of the Eighteenth Century by Mr. EDMUND GOSSE, and that on Modern Literature by Professor DOWDEN. It is hoped that these volumes may be issued at no very distant date."

As may be seen, Mr. Gosse has fulfilled his task; not so Mr. Brooke and Professor Dowden, so that I may be permitted to concur in the hope expressed in the concluding sentence of the advertisement. I may say in the beginning that I wish Mr. Gosse had imitated Mr. Saintsbury in prefixing an analytical table of contents to his volume. It is a great convenience to the reader to have the several subjects of a chapter at hand for reference, for no one can tell beforehand who besides "Pope" are treated in a chapter thus headed. As a matter of fact, Addison, Pomfret, and John Philips precede Pope, and Prior, Gay, Parnell, Ambrose Phillips, Tickell, Somerville, Croxall, and Allan Ramsay follow him, in very brief notices, and we have no analysis of the contents of the twenty-five pages on Pope. This heaping-up of minor writers in brief notices is, too, a fault that may be found with both works, perhaps to a greater extent with Mr. Saintsbury's than with Mr. Gosse's book, for there were more *very* minor writers during that period. In a History of English Literature it does not seem to me to be necessary to include everybody who may have scribbled a scrap of prose or poetry. They have been consigned to oblivion for several centuries, and in oblivion they may well remain. They may possibly be included in dictionaries of authors, but not in histories of literature. As an extreme illustration of what I mean, I find in the contents of Mr. Saintsbury's tenth chapter on "Caroline Poetry" the name Montrose, and when I search that chapter to learn something about him, all I find is (p. 392): "I should not like to have to choose between Herrick and Milton's earlier poems; between Herrick, Carew, Crashaw, Montrose, Lovelace, and Suckling combined on the one hand, and *The Faerie Queene* on the other." I do not find him mentioned in any History of Literature accessible to me, but presumably James Grahame, Marquis of Montrose (1612-50), better known as a historical than as a literary character, who, Allibone tells us under Grahame, "wrote a number of poems," is referred to; so this entry serves as a mere index of mention. Others are treated at more or less length, but the space occupied by these might well have been given to the treatment of more prominent writers.

Mr. Saintsbury purposely pays little attention to "what some moderns call the 'bio-bibliographical' side of the matter," but I could wish that he had paid more, for one does not like to have to refer to one book for such details and to another for the criticism. He says: "My dates and my biographical facts I take for the most part from others." The biographical facts are scanty, and the dates are often given only in the index. I rather agree with Mr. Gosse, who, while apologizing for his profusion of dates, says: "I have the impression that dates, if reasonably treated, present a great assistance to the comparative student, and really should prevent, instead of causing, interruption"—and he is right, *me judice*. In studying literature we want to know the *man* as well as the *book*, and we cannot get at that without some knowledge of his life,

which the historian of literature should give. But after saying my say on these points, I must thank both of these authors for the additions which they have made to genuine criticism of English literature. Their names and styles are too well known to dwell on, but I could wish that Mr. Saintsbury had stricken out some of his French and other foreign terms and thus given us a purer English. Mr. Gosse seems to have pruned the exuberance of his style, as seen in some of his other works, and thus improved it.

The necessary brevity of this notice will not admit of an examination of the critical judgments of these authors, but I may call special attention to Mr. Saintsbury's criticism of Milton, both of his character and of his writings. After the fulsome eulogy that we often see bestowed upon Milton by critics, it is refreshing to meet with sentences like the following (p. 317): "On the whole Milton's character was not an amiable one, nor even wholly estimable." And here follows what is, in my opinion, a very just criticism of that character. Milton possessed all the egotism and the prejudices of the most partisan Puritan, and it is well that somebody has at last been found to say it. Mr. Saintsbury considers that in *Comus* "Milton's poetical power is at its greatest height," while Mr. Pattison ten years ago called *Lycidas* the "high-water mark of English poetry." But whatever may be true as to the comparative superiority of Milton's several poetical works, Mr. Saintsbury gives us a very just judgment of his prose, unless perhaps he overrates its merits. He says (p. 322): "There is no English prose before him, none save Taylor's and Browne's in his time, and absolutely none after him that can compare with the finest passages of these singular productions." That may be, but we cannot judge an author by his "finest passages," and the criticism that follows seems to me more judicious. Mr. Saintsbury does not minimize the faults of Milton's prose, but he considers it very fine notwithstanding. He says, however (p. 326): "It might be contended with some plausibility that this abundance of jewels, or purple patches" [a phrase of which Mr. S. is very fond, as it perpetually recurs], "brings into rather unfair prominence the slips of grammar and taste, the irregularities of thought, the deplorable attempts to be funny, the rude outbursts of bargee invective, which also occur so numerous." These certainly detract from excellence of style, and I rather prefer the simplicity of old Fuller, whom Mr. S. relegates to a minor place in "Caroline Prose," and the smoothness of Jeremy Taylor, when he is not talking of "the fringes of the north star," to the cumbrous sentences of Milton, even in the *Areopagitica*, that much over-praised work. This chapter, however, well deserves study, for Mr. S. limits himself here to a discussion of Milton, Taylor, Clarendon, Browne and Hobbes, and has given us some interesting criticism. I must refer to Mr. S.'s criticism of Ben Jonson, and especially of his prose style (pp. 218, 219), even though we have so little of it. He very rightly praises "the straightforward, vigorous English of these *Discoveries*," which contain "an admirable short tractate on style which exemplifies what it preaches; and a large number of other excellent things." It may be noted in passing that Mr. Swinburne, in his recent work, "*A Study of Ben Jonson*," is in full agreement with Mr. Saintsbury as to the excellence of Ben Jonson's prose. Attention may also be directed to what Mr. Saintsbury has said of Shakspeare's *Sonnets* (pp. 161-4) and the questions connected therewith. As Carlyle said of the authorship of

the Letters of Junius, "it doesn't matter the value of a brass farthing" who "Mr. W. H." was, or "the dark lady," or "the rival poet." Those who have abundance of leisure may busy themselves with these questions, but the ordinary reader will enjoy the *Sonnets* apart from them, and moreover will not consider that *all* of the *Sonnets* are equally enjoyable, as Shakspeare-maniacs are prone to do, who will not permit adverse criticism of any of them.

The limits of this notice will permit but a few remarks on Mr. Gosse's book. Without the fear of Mr. Collins before his eyes, Mr. Gosse starts out with giving Waller the credit for the introduction of the heroic couplet, and calls Denham "his first disciple" (p. 4), stating that he "had perceived and had accepted the reform suggested by Waller," and quoting Dryden's testimony to the effect that Denham followed Waller. Cowley's "Song" is pronounced "unnavigable," though his prose receives its due meed of praise: "Cowley's *Essays* should be read by every student of English prose." But most noticeable is his criticism of the *dii majores* of this period, Dryden and Pope, and especially a brief parallel between the two (pp. 24, 25 and p. 133), wherein Dryden very rightly takes precedence. Mr. Gosse discusses Pope at greater length than any other single writer, if I remember rightly, and is inclined to apologize for his faults, attributing them to his physical weakness (p. 132). But we cannot so easily excuse Pope's conduct, for he was, as Mr. Gosse acknowledges, "an unscrupulous and intriguing trickster." If one wishes a good account of the Pope-Addison episode, let him read and compare Mr. Stephen's Pope and Mr. Courthope's Addison in the "English Men of Letters" series, a series of literary biographies that gives a better idea of the *men*, as well as their works, than is elsewhere to be found in brief in English literature. Pope is rightly given credit for polishing the heroic couplet, a credit that no one wishes to deny him, but it may well be inquired, "Does that constitute a great poet?" and we are forced to concur in the apt criticism: "He has no romance, no spirituality, no mystery, and the highest regions of poetry he never so much as dreams of" (p. 133). We heartily sympathize too with what Mr. Gosse has to say of Dryden's prose (pp. 90-94): "He is the manliest, the most straightforward, the most authoritative prose writer of the age, and, in his long career of more than thirty years, he surveyed and laid out the whole estate of modern English prose"; and again: "He is not only a fine dramatist and a very lofty poet, but a great pioneer in prose criticism also." But for Dryden the Queen Anne writers would have found their task much more difficult, and the cultivation of English prose might have been postponed to a much later period.

We can generally agree with Mr. Gosse's criticisms, but I think he unduly depreciates Bolingbroke's style, i. e. judging from his *Letters on the Study of History*. He says (p. 174): "His boasted style, though unquestionably lucid, is slipshod and full of platitudes, grandiloquent and yet ineffectual." Now this seems to me to be going too far, for in the history of English prose Bolingbroke must be taken into account. I shall merely set opposite to it the judgment of a scholar, which appears to me more just. Professor Adamson says (*Enc. Brit.*, Vol. IV, p. 7): "Bolingbroke's philosophical writings are indeed insufferably wearisome, and it is only in them that his style ever flags and grows cumbersome, for his other writings are in many respects the perfection of English prose style, and can stand comparison even with the finished com-

positions of Addison." This reminds me that I may well direct attention also to what Mr. Gosse says of the characters and styles of Addison and Steele, without taking time to say more than that we might spare the word "meticulous" (p. 194), which Webster's "Unabridged" pronounces *obsolete*, and which is not found in dictionaries of lesser capacity. I sympathize too with what he says of Collins and Gray, especially with his remark (p. 235): "It may perhaps be allowed to be an almost infallible criterion of a man's taste for the highest forms of poetic art to inquire whether he has or has not a genuine love for the verses of William Collins." This parallel also seems to me well drawn: "While Gray was the greater intellectual figure of the two, the more significant as a man and a writer, Collins possessed something more thrilling, more spontaneous, as a purely lyrical poet." This agrees, *leniori modo*, with what Mr. Swinburne has said, with his usual extravagance (Ward's English Poets, Vol. III, p. 279): "As an elegiac poet Gray holds for all ages to come his unassailable and sovereign station; as a lyric poet, he is simply unworthy to sit at the feet of Collins."

Mr. Gosse's treatment of Johnson, Goldsmith, Gibbon and Burke will well repay perusal. We could wish the mere mention of many of the minor writers, *nominis parvi umbræ*, absent, and the space given to a fuller treatment of some others who are too briefly passed over, as Sheridan, for example. But we shall not quarrel with the author for this: we are grateful for what we have. As a history of literature Mr. Gosse's book seems to include what is wanted in a better manner than Mr. Saintsbury's, but both are valuable additions to the subject and must take their place among the best we have. It is to be hoped that the remaining volumes will speedily appear and will cover their ground equally as well as these, although it may be suggested to Professor Dowden not to try to do too much. In the modern period especially, many names may be relegated to a dictionary of authors that do not deserve a place in a history of literature. What is wanted, and what Professor Dowden is well qualified to give us, judging from his work in Shaksperian criticism, is a compendious statement of the principles of literary criticism, for now we search for it in vain. Each critic seems to be a law unto himself and to follow his own sweet will.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Introduction to Our Early English Literature (from the earliest times to the Norman Conquest). By W. CLARKE ROBINSON, M. A., Ph. D. Heidelberg University; Graduate of the University of France; Lecturer in Modern Literature and Languages in the University of Durham. London, Durham, and Heidelberg, 1885.

Although published five years ago this little book seems unknown on this side of the water. Meantime Professor Robinson has transferred his labors to this country and is a professor in Kenyon College, Ohio. The work consists of an introduction giving "an historical sketch of the Teutonic tribes and settlements in Europe, and of their earliest literature," followed by a brief synopsis of Anglo-Saxon grammar and some remarks on versification. The bulk of the work comprises short extracts, with literary notices and translations, of each poem in Anglo-Saxon literature, so that "Early English" here

means *Anglo-Saxon*. The extracts are taken from Grein, a few from Grein-Wülker, and the translations are made by the author. The book thus serves as a useful compendium for the young student who desires some knowledge of Anglo-Saxon poetry, for only a list of the prose writings is given in an appendix. A general criticism on this plan may be made that more space is given to the minor than to the greater and more important poems, to *The Wanderer* or *The Seafarer*, for example, than to the *Beowulf*.

The author puts together the so-called poems of Caedmon "under the headship of Caedmon, at least for the sake of classification," and says: "Of these poems there is little doubt that the *Genesis*, for the greater part, is the real work of Caedmon." He also ascribes to Cynewulf not only the acknowledged, but the contested, poems, and to these adds *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*, and says (p. 97): "It is not at all improbable that Cynewulf may have written them in his earlier poetic life." He remarks in his preface: "In the disputed question of Cynewulf I have followed Prof. ten Brink's view; but perhaps Prof. Wülker is correct in identifying him with the 10th Bishop of Lindisfarne." Now Wülker has expressly asserted that Cynewulf was probably a West-Saxon, not a Northumbrian, and not the Bishop of Lindisfarne (*Anglia*, I 483 ff., and *Grundriss*, p. 158).

Professor Robinson seems to me inconsistent in respect to the *Runic Lines on the Cross at Ruthwell*, which he ascribes to Caedmon (p. 29), and *The Dream of the Cross*, which he ascribes to Cynewulf (p. 69). The former are but a Northumbrian version of certain lines of the latter, doubtless the original (of which the West-Saxon poem is the version), but both by the same author. Moreover, the fact that the cross has the words engraven on the top in Runic letters, "*Cadmon mæ fauæþo*," need not imply that Caedmon wrote the poem, but only that a sculptor of that name made the stone cross, as has already been suggested. Professor Robinson does, indeed, say (p. 69): "It is possible, however, that Cynewulf is the real author both of this poem and of the inscriptions at Ruthwell, and that the sculptor, or his employers, mistakenly attributed the lines to the first and better known poet, and engraved on the stone the name of Caedmon instead of Cynewulf." The assumption of a mistake is gratuitous, and the possibility is rather a strong probability, for I confess to an agreement with ten Brink *vs.* Wülker in respect to the Northumbrian origin of Cynewulf and his authorship of the *Dream of the Cross*, as has already been stated in the introduction to my translation of the *Elene* (cf. Kennedy's translation of ten Brink's "Early English Literature," p. 388).

It would prolong this notice to too great length to examine the translations of the several extracts which Professor Robinson gives as specimens. Taking at random *The Fight at Finnsburg*, I wish Prof. R. had given the "reason to suppose the Hengest of this poem was the same who first led the Jutes to battle for the soil of Britain in the year 449 A. D." He omits mention of Hnaef, who first led the Danes, on whose fall Hengest assumed command. It might also have been stated that we are now entirely dependent on Hickes's transcription for the text of this poem, as the leaf from which he transcribed it has been lost. The text here is taken from Heyne's fourth ed. of *Beowulf* (1879), but a better text will be found in Heyne's fifth ed., by Socin (1888), which is nearer to Grein-Wülker (1881). Socin still writes *fēr* for *hēr* (line 5), but changes

hebbað back to *habbað* (line 10), and *handa* to *linda*. The translation in my *Béowulf* (pp. 97, 98) was made from the text in the separate edition of Grein (1867), who made several important emendations, hence some of the differences. I cannot concur with some of Prof. R.'s renderings, and especially with his translation of *gylleð graghama*, "the cricket chirps." The vocabulary of this poem was omitted in the glossary of even Heyne's fourth ed., but Socin has inserted these words and followed Grein in rendering, *die Rüstung klirrt. hornās* (line 1) should be *hornas*.

Not having tested the renderings of the other pieces (except to observe that the rendering of the short extract from *Béowulf* is very "free," and that the text has *aldor-ledse* (line 15) and the translation *aldor-ceare* (the alternative reading), I cannot speak as to their correctness. A revision would, perhaps, not come amiss. I cannot lay down the book, however, without thanking Professor R. for having made it by honest work, and expressing the hope that it may become better known to students.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REPORTS.

HERMES, 1888.

III.

J. Toepfer (Göttingen). *Die Attischen Pythaisten und Deliaisten*. This is an antiquarian article in which are gathered up the various notices bearing on the *θεωποι* to Delphi and to Delos and the worship of the Delian Apollo, introduced by way of the eastern coast of Attica, notices found in the Atticist lexica chiefly, and in Strabo and Pausanias. To this is joined some rather fervid and sanguine archaeological interpretation. It would be a hopeless task to endeavor to report the gist of an article which is ill-sifted and absolutely lacking in unity and perspicuity.

Th. Thalheim. The suit brought by Androcles (private speech of Demosth.) against Lakritos, and a consideration of the documents contained in it. Th. does not share the radical view which rejects *all* documents found in the Attic orators as spurious. The *στίχοι*, it is true, were not counted for documents in the old MS from which these data were compiled, but the documents were, e. g. in the copy to which Harpocration (*Μένδην, σύλας, διοπεύων*) refers.—In discussing the legal aspects of the case itself, Th. holds that both Artemon and Apollodorus were brothers of the defendant Lakritos, and suggests an explanation why the speaker kept Apollodorus so much in the background. In this matter he dissents from Blass. The affidavits indeed seem more pertinent as against Apollodorus than as against Lakritos. Thalheim says on this point, p. 338, that the speaker intended at one time to bring suit against Apollodorus and collected the affidavits against the latter, but when Ap. had escaped from the charge by leaving the city, the speaker turned against Lakritos these very affidavits, which had the same force against Artemon and the latter's so-called heir Lakritos as they had against Apollodorus. In his further analysis Th. opposes the view that the contract and affidavits were foisted into the speech by a later grammarian.

B. Keil. *Epikritische Isocrates-studien*. 1. K. re-edits a papyrus fragment of Isocrates now preserved in the Musée Borely, near Marseilles, probably of the fourth century A. D. with strong traces of iotacism. (Inf. -iv for *ειν*.)¹ Those readings of the MS which are new are devoid of value. 2. Discussion of ethical terms *ἀνδρεία ἀρετή* and the gradual development of the latter into generic valuation; Homer, Hesiod, lyrical poets, Socrates and his school, where the four cardinal virtues were systematized. Keil even suggests that there is an allusion to Socrates' ethics in Aristoph. *Avv.* 1537 sqq.² The Socratic school certainly elaborated not only the best state but also the ideal

¹ See A. J. P. VI 397; VIII 111.

² Possibly. That Aristophanes makes fun of a specific theory at all seems rather far-fetched.—E. G. S.

of a prince, as Xenophon did in his presentation of the elder Cyrus. This scheme of Socratic classification of virtue and virtues is evidently accepted by Isocrates, e. g. ad Nicoclem, where heavy interpolations are claimed by Keil, whereas, to his mind, the genuine portions show the outline and skeleton of the genuine elements of the oration following the four cardinal virtues. Many of those exhortations and precepts which are considered spurious by Keil are placed in parallel column with kindred or fairly similar passages from Aristotle, *Ethica Nicom.* "Man wird nicht bestreiten dass die Stellen der beiden Columnen in einem gegenseitigen Abhängigkeitsverhältniss zu einander stehen." [The present abstractor doubts this very much indeed; it is one of those fatal substitutions of *must* for *may* which vitiate so much of German scholarship.] Keil's valuation of Isocrates, pp. 372 sq., is very readable and suggestive.

U. Köhler. *Hermokopiden inschriften.* Fragments of Inss. dealing with the confiscation of the property of the men involved in the famous state-trial of 415 B. C. Köhler's exposition proceeds calmly and thoroughly, a flood of light being thrown, e. g. on No. 3 (dealing with the sale of the bedroom furniture of Alcibiades) from Pollux *Onomasticon* X 32 sqq. Pollux often quotes *δημόπρατα*, lists of confiscations. These Köhler assigns to Krateros *συναγωγὴ ψηφισμάτων*.

A. Busse. The historian and the philosopher Dexippus. The historian lived at Athens about 273 A. D. Of the philosopher we have a commentary on the categories of Aristotle, where he cites Iamblichus, whose pupil by-the-by he was. He died probably about 353. Eunapius has been blamed as confounding the two.

B. Niese. Das sogenannte Licinisch-Sextische Ackergesetz. Tiberius Gracchus is said to have tried to enforce or restore the efficacy of the agrarian law of Licinius and Sextius of 367 B. C. We must distinguish, however, between the version of Plutarch and Appian, on the one side, and the Livian annalistic account on the other. The sources of the former are, on the whole, older and better. The situation of Roman society, economically considered, in 367 differed vastly from the same in 146 or 133. In 367 the *ager publicus* was too insignificant in extent to warrant stipulations such as that which fixed the maximum of possession at 500 jugera. It may be instructive to note the various important conquests:

- 396 sqq. Volscian and Veientians made into tribes.
- 340. Latins and Campanians (after 340) made into tribes.
- 313. The dictator Fabius distributed lands to soldiers (Diodorus 19, 101).
- 306. Hernican land sold outright.
- 304. Some land of the Aequi made into two new tribes and two colonies.
- 290. End of Samnite wars. Much land left as *ager publicus* by Dentatus, of which land much probably was assigned in 241, when the tribes Quirina and Velina were made.

285. Senonian conquest, parcelled out to Roman citizens in 233.

Niese proposes in consideration of all this to eliminate the agrarian part from the laws of 367, which agrarian law indeed cannot have been passed until a considerable time after the consummation of the conquest of Italy.

Cicero, de lege Agraria, does not mention Stolo and Sextius. Polybius (II 21, 8) estimates the division of the Ager Gallicus by Flaminius in 233 as the *inception* of an evil and sinister political development (*ἀρχηγὸν μὲν γενέσθαι τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον διαστροφῆς*). The "Licinian" limitation indeed seems to have been of later origin than the distribution of 233. It was in force in the time of the elder Cato, who cites it (Gellius VI 3) about 167. The limitation was established probably about 180 B. C. Like Mommsen, Niese rejects as a spurious tradition (or projection from later conditions backward) the "agrarian law" of Sp. Cassius as well as the other kindred laws of the earlier republic. Niese goes so far as to suggest, by way of inference, that even the other much more famous law of Licinius and Sextius concerning the access of plebeians to the consulate is tainted with suspicion [an inference which impresses the present writer as a doubtful one].

Robert. "Olympische Glossen." Comments and elucidation of problems concerning Olympia, topographical and archaeological, largely on Pausanias's reports: 1. Tropaion of the Elians, commemorating a victory over Sparta. 2. The Agora. 3. The inscriptions on the chest of Kypselos. 4. Pantarkes, an Olympian victor, VI 10, 6.

A. Wilhelm. Zur Geschichte der Attischen Kleruchen auf Lemnos. Inss. found in 1887 on the Acropolis, with which he combines one found in 1877. Contents, a motion to commend officially Komeas, who had been cavalry commander in the Attic colony of Lemnos, himself Athenian born, of deme Lamptrae. Also a decree of the Attic colony itself concerning Komeas. The inscriptions are of the earlier part of the third century, when the Athenians and their Cleruchi in the colony favored king Seleucus as against king Lysimachus.

U. Wilcken. Notes on [the original character of] the Berlin fragment (Fayūm papyrus) of Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*.

Ad. Busse. Critical notes on Aristotle, de Anima III 11, p. 434a, 12-15 (Bekker).

IV.

O. Kern. Theogoniae Orphicae fragmenta nova, edited. These are found in a Venice MS of Damascius, last leader of the Neoplatonic school at Athens, which he left in consequence of Justinian's edict in 527 A. D.

H. Bürger, in Zu Apuleius, discusses the question whether the introduction to the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius is partly autobiographical, as E. Rohde (Rhein. Mus. 40) holds, of Apuleius himself. B. argues that *all* the introduction is intended to produce the effect that the narrator and the author are one, viz. the Lucius of Corinth whose character Apuleius has assumed.

K. Bürger. Critical notes on the Pseudo-Lucianic *Ὀνογ.* B. holds that this novel in its present form is an abstract from a larger original work, and that a good portion of the textual difficulties is due to that fact. Bürger's *modus operandi* is to parallel the narrative in Lucian with that in Apuleius, and to draw his conclusions, e. g.,

C. I. καὶ ἄλλων ἐκοινωνοῦμεν καὶ οὕτως
ἐκείνην τὴν ἀργαλέαν ὁδὸν ἀνύσαντες
πλησίον ἦδη τῆς πόλεως ἤμεν.

Apul. I 20, Asperam denique ac
prolixam viam sine labore ac taedio
evasi.

Bürger demands an equivalent on the Greek side for *sine labore ac taedio*, but such criticism is too schoolmasterly and can hardly be called cogent.

Rothstein on the Dirae and the Lydia in the body of Vergil's works. Scaliger assigned them to Valerius Cato, and Ribbeck, in his recent charming work on the history of Roman poetry, reiterates that view. Jacobs and Naeke differed from Scaliger in this only, that they claimed the necessity of establishing two distinct pieces, Dirae and Lydia. Rothstein insists that the two pieces are so unlike each other that a different author must be assumed for each; the Lydia, bearing strong marks of youthfulness on the part of the author, uses the common apparatus of amatory poesy, whereas the Dirae carry the impress of personal and individual concern. After a detailed analysis Rothstein sums up as follows, p. 524: Quamquam igitur neque Vergilii sunt neque Latinae siren timeretur tamen neutrum indignum est philologorum opera quia alterum exemplo esse potest quia in versibus componendis facultate Augustea aetate vel mediocri ingenii homines uterentur, alterum conscriptum est ab egregio poeta, qui non ultimum inter Romana ingenia locum obtinet.¹

A. Krause. Miscellen zur Geschichte Alexanders. The battle of Gaugamela took place, not on Oct. 1, 331 (old style), but on Sep. 30, 331 (bibliographical detail valuable). There were no phalangites in Alexander's army but Macedonians.

G. Kaibel. Inscriptions of Pisidia. Notes and reports on Dr. Sterrett's epigraphic tour, undertaken at the cost of the late Miss Catharine Wolfe, of New York (Am. School at Athens, 1888, Boston). Kaibel estimates the value of this collection in the handsomest terms. "The fine volume contains 651 inscriptions, not all of equal value, of course, but hardly one that does not give desirable information about history or topography, about public or private life, about religion or language; moreover, all of them were copied by Dr. Sterrett with great care, partly revised after squeezes." A large inscription of Anabura, Pisidia, gives the precepts of a dice oracle; particular divinities favor certain throws; amongst the divinities being Κρόνος τεκνοφάγος and Βλάβη. The dice oracle rules were evidently presented for public use by Antiochus and Bianor, members of a distinguished family. The visitor needed merely his own dice. Some inscriptions on a rock on the bank of the Kodja are permeated by Stoic sentiment and are marked by elevation and dignity of literary form.

Van Herwerden (Utrecht). "Ad Diodorum Siculum." Textual criticism *à propos* of the recent edition of D. by Vogel, 1888. Elimination of a word often indeed makes the sense clearer and more terse, but authors do not always cast their expression into the tersest and grammatically most perfect form. On the other hand, the careful notation of habit, i. e. grammar, is often effectively applied to preserve readings, e. g. I 81, ὥς δ' ὅν, which Diodorus uses freely as an equivalent to ἄτε. (On the whole, the negative canon of H. is fairly contained in a phrase used p. 550, on III 4, 3: "locum sic scriptum interpretari

¹ See Robinson Ellis in the last number of A. J. P.

nequeo.") The MS reads (in the discussion of the function of hieroglyphic symbols): ὁ δὲ ὀφθαλμὸς (εἴτε understood from preceding sentence) δίκης τηρητῆς καὶ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος φύλαξ. H. suggests inserting after δίκης < καὶ φυλακῆς, τῶν πάντων (δυντῶν?) ὧν > τηρητῆς κτέ. I would certainly ask for a commentary by the author of the emendation before I could understand the passage thus emended. Perhaps instead of "*locum sic scriptum interpretari nequeo*" a more cogent canon would be: *Nemo locum sic scriptum interpretari potest.*

M. Wellmann. Zur Geschichte der Medicin im Alterthum.

K. P. Schulze. Der Codex M des Catull. The MS G has been highly valued, as it permits one to make inferences as to the archetypus. Baehrens was wrong, however, in saying that with the exception of O all extant MSS of Catullus are derived from G. Similar qualities may be ascribed to a Venice MS of Catullus, M, recently collated by Ellis. In this MS too the peculiarity of double readings is notable.

U. Wilcken. Kaiserliche Tempelverwaltung in Aegypten. Notes from some paypri now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, letters which passed in ordinary routine of business between imperial officials in the fifth year of Septimius Severus (= 197 A. D.) The subject-matter of one of the letters is of more than passing interest. The procurator Augusti and διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην directs the *tabularius* of the Jupiter Capitolinus temple at Arsinoë to take the following action: There are vacant two positions, of *στολισταί* (keepers of the divine wardrobe). Two candidates have made application and have offered a certain sum. The *tabularius* is directed to have the positions put up at auction. διαδεχόμενος τὴν ἀρχ. is something like deputy pontifex. Another letter directs that the people shall keep their swine away from the temple of Talmis.

Spiro on σύμπτυκτοι ἀνάπαιστοι (Pherecrates Comicus in Kock I, p. 166.)

E. Maas. Mythische Kurznamen. Pet names or abbreviations of a kindred effect (ὑποκορισμός). Alkimos for Alkimedon in Iliad 24, 574, Melas for Melanthos, Demo for Demophile, Adon for Adonis, Ampyx for Ampykos, Askles for Asklepios, Aster for Asterios, Aphro for Aphrodite, Glauke for Glaukopis, etc.

E. G. SIHLER.

PHILOLOGUS, XLVII.

Heft 3.

I.—TREATISES.

XX. Pp. 385-399. Babriana, by Th. Bergk. Discussion of two attempts to restore the original form of some of the Babrian fables from the prose paraphrase of Aesop, viz. the Codex Vind. and the Codex Athous. This latter sylloge was evidently in the hands of the maker of the former. The Athoan diascueast was clearly not Menas, though the sylloge was everywhere interpolated by him. Moreover, the Codex Athous, so far as it contains fables in common with the Codex Vat., by no means yields in value to this, but equals or excels it.

P. 399. In Avianus XXVIII 7, *Vana laboratis aufer mendacia dictis*, Nettle-ship suggests that *laboratis* might mean "fabricated," "unreal," while R. Ellis,

in his late edition (see A. J. P. IX, p. 359) emends by suggesting *vaporatis*. Crusius defends the interpretation of Nettleship by quoting Babrius 95, 36: *ὁ νοῦς ἐχαυνώθη λόγοισιν ποιητοῖσιν*.

XXI. Pp. 400-425. On Heraclitus (4), by Christian Cron (continued from Heft 2).

P. 425. Apuleius Apol. c. 83. M. Petschenig proposes to read *πορίσαι· νῦν δὲ ὡς βάσκανοι ἡμῶν κακοήθεις τε*.

XXII. Pp. 426-433. Critical and exegetical notes on Demosthenes de Corona, by W. Schmid. §2. The reading *ἀλλὰ τὸ καὶ τῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ* is defended against Lipsius's *ἀλλὰ καὶ τό*. §12. *ἡ προαίρεσις αὐτῇ ἐχθροῦ*; necessary on rhetorical and logical grounds to place a comma before *ἐχθροῦ*, and consequently to write both *αὐτῇ* and *αὐτῇ*, between which the MSS vary: *ἡ προαίρεσις αὐτῇ αὐτῇ*. It follows hence that γάρ in §13 is the right reading, but δεῖ (wanting in Σ) is the substitute for some verb lost from the archetype. No conjecture is offered as to what this verb was. §18 *fin*. For *παρὰ τοῖς* write *παρ' αὐτοῖς*. §19. The evidence favors *γένηται*, not *γένοιτο*. §22. *νῦν διεξήεις* and *νῦν κατηγορεῖς* are to be read. The rule of the Byzantine grammarians was *νῦν* with all tenses, *νυνί* only with the present. Attic usage does not sustain the rule, but it is natural that the grammarians should correct according to their canon. §25. *τε τὴν εἰρήνην* is a gloss of *πάντα*, which got even into the *prima manus* of Σ. §28. *τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως* defended against Usener's clever conjecture *τὰ κέρματα*.

P. 433. Emendationum ad Aristidem specimen II. W. Schmid offers in Or. XLV eight conjectures; in Or. XLVI five.

XXIII. Pp. 434-448. Date and author of Ps.-Apuleius, De orthographia, by O. Crusius. This is an interesting contribution to the history of plagiarisms. The spuriousness of the fragments of this so-called L. Caecilius Minutianus Apuleius was shown by Madvig (*Opusc. Acad.* I, p. 1 ff.), and, in spite of Osann's protest, has been generally accepted. Crusius now seeks by a more careful investigation to determine the date and author of the composition. By close and careful reasoning, which we cannot here follow, he renders it very probable that the Ps.-Apuleius was Ludovicus Caelius Rhodiginus, a contemporary of Erasmus, and whom Erasmus accused of plagiarism in a work which he wrote entitled *Antiquae Lectiones*. This work shows the same hand as the *Fragmenta de orthographia*, and is the first work that cites these fragments. Crusius has certainly made out a strong case against the learned professor, who seems to have enjoyed an enviable reputation in his day, for soon after his death Erasmus writes of him: *Narrant enim . . . fuisse virum integritatis christianae nullo studiorum labore fatigabilem*.

P. 448. A few remarks by Crusius on the sources of Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*.

XXIV. Pp. 449-486. The ten Eponymi and the order of succession of the Attic Phylae, by A. Mommsen. The order of succession of the *φυλαί* was determined for some purposes by lot, and lasted for a definite period, e. g. one year; for other purposes another order, not subject to the lot, prevailed, which

may be called the sacred order, viz. Erechtheis, Aegeis, Pandionis, Leontis, Akamantis, Oeneis, Kekropis, Hippothontis, Aeantis, Antiochis. This sacred order of the *φύλαι* was established by Cleisthenes, and obtained even in the days of the Roman emperors. As to the cause of the adoption of just these Eponymi we are not to take the standpoint of the period of the Epigoni (Pollux, who says that Apollo selected the *older* heroes), but that of the sixth century B. C., namely, that those heroes were preferred who were then especially worshipped or seemed to Cleisthenes especially worthy of honor. It seems that Cleisthenes, arranging the year according to tenths, gave each of these to an especial hero, Erechtheus, Aegeus, etc. "It is at least not an accident that the first Eponymus points to a festival of the first tenth, the second to one of the second tenth, and so for the third, sixth, seventh and ninth eponymi religious relations to the corresponding tenths obtain. Those heroes for whom no such relation can be shown to have obtained—Leos, Akamas; Hippothon, Antiochus—are the less known, and we may believe that, if tradition were more complete, also for these such relations would not be wanting. Cleisthenes then so arranged the matter of the Eponymi that the heroes numbered after the sacred order accorded with the traditional usages of the tenths of the year assigned to them."

XXV. Pp. 487-514. The Hastiferi of the Castellum Mattiacorum, by H. C. Maué. The hastiferi of Castel (civitas Mattiacorum) have long been known from a dedicatory inscription in honor of Virtus Bellonā, of the year 236 A. D. Since the discovery of this inscription in 1809 two views have been current as to the nature of these hastiferi, some taking them to be a kind of municipal militia, others regarding them as a sacred college. The first view is that of Mommsen and Marquardt, the second is that of our author, who finds his opinion strikingly confirmed by an inscription on a sandstone altar found two years ago on the bank of the Rhine, bearing the date March 24, 224 A. D. This inscription has the peculiar value of being the first which gives with plainness the oldest Roman name of Castel. These hastiferi took part in the worship of Bellona, which, though of oriental origin, was widespread, especially along the Rhine districts. They consisted of shepherds, for these were accustomed to carry the spear to protect their flocks from beasts of prey and robbers. The detailed proof of the article is wrought out with much care and the polemic against Mommsen's view is convincing.

XXVI. Pp. 514-551. Late works on the dress and equipment of the Roman army in time of the empire, by A. Müller. This article forms a continuation of a similar one in Vol. 33, pp. 632-685, and examines quite a number of recent and valuable works, as Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, Band II, 2te Aufl. 1884; Max Jahn's *Handbuch einer Gesch. d. Kriegswesen v. d. Urzeit bis zur Renaissance*, 1880; Lindenschmit, *Tracht u. Bewaffnung d. röm. Heeres während d. Kaiserzeit*, 1882. Besides these a number of works on special technical points, articles in journals, etc., are cited. Within the last fifteen years more attention has been paid to inscriptions and monuments, and from these we get often most accurate information. Roman art was realistic and its remains can generally be relied upon. Lindenschmit's work is discussed at considerable length. In plan it is somewhat faulty, as it aims to com-

bine the scientific with the didactic method, that is, to mark an advance in its investigations and be at the same time suited for school use. Some of the illustrations have been faultily restored and are therefore not reliable. Comments on the various parts of Roman armor and weapons follow, as *galea*, *cassis*, *lorica*, *gladius*, *pilum*, *hasta*, etc. On the whole he considers Lindenschmit's work a good one and will welcome a new edition.

P. 551. Wagener pleads for C. W. F. Müller's reading, Cic. pro Lig., *ante hanc diem*, in spite of the uniform MSS reading *hunc*.

II.—MISCELLANEOUS.

18. Pp. 552-554. On the Cypria. R. Peppmüller discusses the first fragment in connexion with the new material offered by Ludwig, Rh. Mus. 1887, p. 472 f.

19. P. 554. Observations on the MS (Cod. Marc. 211) of Porphyrius De antro Nympharum, by Erich Bethe.

20. Pp. 555-558. Aemilii Macri Theriacon fragmenta duo, by Rob. Unger. The first one is contained in the Lucani commenta Bern. VI 488, and was attributed to Aemilius Macer by Usener. Unger taking his cue from Verg. Aen. VI 419, emends as follows: Offa < s > cit aene < as > va < let extendiss > e colubras; Offa (scit Aeneas) valet extendisse colubras.

21. Pp. 562-568. Contributions to the history of Roman prose writers in the Middle Ages, by M. Manitius. (1) Solinus. That this author was well known is attested both by the number of MSS extant and also by the frequent allusions to his writings in the writers of the Middle Ages. To those quoted in Mommsen's edition quite a number are here added. (2) Tacitus. The extent to which Tacitus was known in the Middle Ages is hard to determine, nor has the matter been very much cleared up by Cornelius. A few new notices are brought forward. (3) Pliny the Younger. The classic epistolary writers were supplanted in the Middle Ages by the letters of the Fathers; yet Pliny seems to have been much read in the fifth century and was known in the tenth and twelfth centuries. (4) Cornelius Nepos. There are but few MSS and but few notices of him in writers of the Middle Ages.

23. P. 568. Mähly suggests for omen the derivation from avis; *avimen > *aumen > omen.

24. Pp. 569-573. Flaviana. Under this title Chambalu contributes five notes on points of history under the Flavian Emperors. In one of these he argues from inscriptions on coins that the expedition of Domitian against the Chatti was before Sept. of the year 83, and not, as Imhof assumes, in 84.

25. Pp. 573-574. Scaenica. W. Schmid argues against the statement of Suidas (s. v. Pratinas) that in consequence of the collapse of the wooden theatre at Athens during a contest between Aeschylus, Choerilus, and Pratinas a new stone theatre was built. The collapse may have been a fact, but the probability is that the new stone theatre was begun not long before the time of Lycurgus (say under Eubulus), and completed by Lycurgus (Plut. Lycurg. 10).

P. 576. Reports of Journals: Revue Archaeol. 1888, Nos. 3, 4.—Mnemosyne, 1887, XV 4; 1888, XVI 1.—Academy, 1888, May 26, June 2, 9, 30.

Heft 4.

I.—TREATISES.

XXVII. Pp. 578–588. Observations concerning some libraries of Sicily, by Fr. Rühl. The information we possess concerning these little known libraries antedates mainly the losses by war and theft in the last decades of Bourbon rule. On the other hand, late guide-books call attention to considerable collections of MSS in various places, thereby misleading scholars with the hope of finding something of especial value, who discover that their finds are by no means in proportion to the outlay of time and trouble. Rühl gives the result of his recent investigations in several libraries, viz. the University Library at Messina, University Library at Catania, Library of S. Nicola at Catania, Bibliotheca Arcivescovile at Syracuse, Bibliotheca Nazionale at Palermo.

XXVIII. Pp. 589–598. Pindar's Sixth Olympic Ode, by L. Bornemann. Critical and exegetical comments.

P. 598. On Tyrtæus and Sappho, by Haeberlin. For Tyrt. Frg. 11, 37 (Bergk) he proposes: ἀντῆι for ἐς αὐτούς; Sappho frg. 1 (Bergk) he would read, ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλέπαν δὲ λῦσον | ἐκ μερίμναν, ὅσσα δέ μοι τέλεσσαι | θυμὸς ἱμέρρει, σὸν τέλεσσον αὐτὰ | σύμμαχος ἔσσαι.

XXIX. Pp. 599–616. On Heraclitus, by Christian Cron. Continued from Heft 3.

XXX. Pp. 617–622. Apophthegmata Laconica, by M. Treu. The editions of the Apophthegmata are based for the most part on one tradition, the Corpus Planudeum. There is another varying considerably from that, the MSS of which group have been little used in establishing the text, though they offer a fuller and sometimes a better text than the Corpus Planudeum. M. Treu gives a selection from the passages that show considerable variation from the ordinary text, as well as those apophthegmata that are not found at all in the editions.

P. 622. M. Treu gives two extracts from the Codex Pal. Graecus 129 Heidelbergensis which he has not met anywhere else.

XXXI. Pp. 623–635. Composition of Petronius's satires, by E. Klebs. From a number of passages it is clear that Encolpius stands in a peculiar relation to the worship of Priapus. One of the most striking of these is the prayer to this deity at the opening of ch. XVI, which Klebs examines at length, reaching the conclusion that it was uttered in consequence of some special crime against the god, such as the pollution of his temple. This anger of Priapus bears the same relation to the adventures of Encolpius as that of Poseidon to the fate of Odysseus, and serves as a central motive around which is grouped the most realistic description of antiquity.

P. 635. Eussner emends Livy VII 2, 4 by substituting for *ceterum parva quoque*, *ceterum parva haec quoque*, and VII 30, 11 *homines ipsi in hanc necessitatem venerunt* instead of *omnes ipsi*, etc.

XXXII. Pp. 636–643. Comparison of the statements of Pliny and Mela in regard to the tribes of central Africa, by E. Schweder. The writer of this

article finds between the statements of Pliny and Mela agreement sufficient to show that both writers drew from a common source, but at the same time there are decided differences which show that by one of these writers the statements of his authority were not rightly understood. By a careful examination Schweder shows that Pliny has preserved the statements in correct form, while Mela has simply misunderstood many of them.

P. 643. Th. Stangl emends two passages of Justinus, proposing *divinitatis* for *dignitatis* in II 9, 15, and *tergeri* for *deleri* in 37, 3, 7.

XXXIII. Pp. 644-652. The heroic deed of Aristophon, by G. F. Unger. According to Demosthenes, Lept. 148, Aristophon was granted the *ἀρέτεια*. The ground for this unusual honor Unger thinks is to be found in a corrupt passage of Theophrastus, Charact. 7: προσδιηγῆσθαι καὶ τὴν ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶντος ποτε γενομένην τοῦ ῥήτορος μάχην καὶ τὴν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὑπὸ Λυσάνδρου. Here ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶντος is not a date, but = *duce Aristophonte* (cf. Thuc. VI 6, 2, τὴν γενομένην ἐπὶ Δάχηςτος ξυμμαχίαν; Xen. Hipparch. I, 12, ἣν ἐπὶ σοῦ ἀναβῶσιν; Dem. Ol. 2, 14, ἐπὶ Τιμοθέου). In the second clause ἐπὶ Λυσάνδρου is the reading of all the MSS except two, and must be restored. It is easy to see, now, how καὶ got into the text: a copyist or reader was led by the double occurrence of the apparent date ἐπὶ τινος to suppose that two battles were meant, which of course had to be connected by καὶ. But one battle, not two, is referred to, and the passage must read: τὴν ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶντος ποτε γενομένην τοῦ ῥήτορος μάχην τὴν Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐπὶ Λυσάνδρου. The deed referred to Unger thinks to be found probably in Xenophon Hell. II 4, 31 ff., and the leader in the brilliant feat of arms there described, Aristophon, strategus 363-2 B. C., a man of tireless energy and a fiery orator even in his latest years.

P. 652. In Dinarchus c. Dem. 28, E. Sihler (of New York) proposes to bracket the second οὗτος as *διτροπαφία*.

XXXIV. Pp. 653-677. History of the legio XIV gemina, by Metellus Meyer. The history of the Roman legions, important as it is for the history of the empire, has never received proper and systematic treatment. As a contribution to this end we have here a very full and valuable account of the legio XIV gemina in three sections: first, origin, name, and insignia; second, the places where it was stationed at different times, and the length of time it remained in each place; third, its deeds and fate from Augustus to Diocletian.

P. 677. H. Deiter emends Caesar B. G. VII 47, 1; Cic. De div. I 9, 15; and Or. 7, 23.

XXXV. Pp. 678-702. Apollo Citharoedus, by Otto A. Hoffmann. The author thinks that this statue is a copy of the famous statue of Apollo by Scopas that was procured by Augustus for his temple on the Palatine. This he argues at length from the coins, especially those of the time of Nero, and the descriptions of the Augustan poets.

P. 702. J. Mähly emends Porphyrio's note on Hor. Sat. I 6, 30.

XXXVI. Pp. 703-709. The so-called Pharmacides of the Cypselus chest. W. H. Roscher agrees with O. Kern (Jahr. d. Arch. Inst. III, p. 234 ff.) that these latter are very closely connected with the remaining mythic-allegorical figures of

the representation; that thus the absence of a superscription is to be explained, and that in this relation the proper interpretation is to be sought. But he disagrees with Kern's explanation of the Pharmacides as Adrasteia and Eide, arguing with much force and probability that "the two figures in question are two *moirae*, who, conceived as pharmacides, prepare in their mortars for mortals weal and woe." He shows in proof, (1) that the mortar-pestle was an attribute of the *moirae* (Apollod. I 6, 2); (2) from Pausan. X 24, 4, etc., that there is no objection to be made on the score of dual *moirae*; (3) the close relation of the *moirae* with Nyx and the other allegorical figures of the representation.

XXXVII. Pp. 710-720. Contributions to the history of Roman poets in the Middle Ages, by Manitius. This article is a continuation of the same subject treated in Hest 3, but rather more pretentious than the notes there given on the prose writers. The author proposes in a series of articles to discuss the allusions to the Roman poets, exclusive of Vergil and Horace, in the Middle Ages. This first article he devotes to Persius, whose early popularity is attested by the number of extant MSS. Quite a number of citations are given from German, French, English, and Italian writers. It is interesting to note that Persius was known and read in England as early as the days of Aldhelm and Venerable Bede.

XXXVIII. Pp. 721-754. A continuation of No. XXVI on the equipment of the Roman army. This paper is devoted principally to the examination of the following works: Otto Benndorf, *Antike Gesichtshelme u. Sepulchralmasken*, 1878; E. Hübner, *Römische Schildbuckel*, Wien, 1878; Lindenschmit, *Bemerkungen üb. d. pilum*. Benndorff shows that the practice of covering the faces of the dead with masks was widespread among the ancients; they served to preserve the familiar form, and suggested the custom of preserving the *imagines*. Next he discusses the subject of ancient helmets, and this part of his work is examined with minute care by Müller, as are also the other works above cited. As most of the paper is taken up with the discussion of minute points it cannot be fully noticed here.

II.—MISCELLANEOUS.

27. P. 754. Ad Inscriptiones Phrygias. W. M. Ramsay defends his conjecture τέκνα ἄωρα ἐντὶ[χοίτο] (see on Graeca Phryg. Ins. in Zts. f. vergl. Sprachforschung, 1878), against Crusius's proposal, τέκνα ἄωρα [λίποίτο] (Philol. 1889, p. 44).

28. Pp. 755-758. Ad Aristophanem. O. Bachmann suggests: Lysist. 723, τὴν δ' αὐτομολοῦσαν, τὴν δ' ἐπὶ στρούθου μίαν. Pax. 278, νῦν εὐκτέ' ἐστὶ Καλλόγη for νῦν ἐστὶν εὐξασθαι καλὸν; Av. 1437, νῦν δ' οὐ λέγων πτερῶ σε for νῦν τοι λέγων πτερῶ σε; Av. 1013, κекίνηται τινι for κекίνηται τινες.

29. Pp. 758-759. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Lautbildung (De comp. verb. 14). Ernst Graf thinks that Usener (Bonner-Sommerkatalog, 1878) has missed the correct reading in three passages where the question is of the influence of the ἀρτηρία.

30. Pp. 760-762. Antonius Liberalis. H. Martini proposes emendations in numerous passages.

31. Pp. 762-764. Another word on Cic. de imp. Cn. Pompei 24. C. Fr. Müller abandons his former reading and accepts the reading supported by v. Leutsch, though moved by other arguments than those brought forward by v. Leutsch.

32. P. 764. Ehwald brings forward additional proof of the correctness of his interpretation of the two verses in Anthol. Lat. I, No. 37 (Philol. XLVI, p. 635).

33. Pp. 765-768. Flaviana, by Chambalu. A continuation of the historical notes begun in Heft 3.

P. 768. Excerpts and reports. A new catalogue of Athos-MSS.—Academy, 1888, Aug. 25.—Anzeiger für Schweiz. Alterthumskunde, 1888, 1.

Pp. 769-778. Indexes.

J. H. KIRKLAND.

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE, 1889.¹

Vol. XIII, pp. 1-32, 121-197. M. A. Bergaigne's researches into the history of Vedic liturgy begin with an examination of the metrical forms of the hymns contained in the R̥gveda. The origin of this Vedic liturgy must be studied above all in the Saṃhita, the sacred text of the R̥gveda. The metrical form shows that even before the establishment of common rites the several families and castes had liturgies, similar to that of the sacrifice of the soma now found in the Veda. A great number of so-called hymns, comprising often the most diverse metres, are in reality simply collections of separate formulas, composed for the express purpose of being recited at different stages of the same ceremony or in successive ceremonies, very much like those described by the Brahmanas and the Sūtras. The Saṃhita of the R̥gveda contains, besides, many fully developed ṣastras, the most important being the praśṅga-ṣastras, the precepts for the morning sacrifice, in Mandala I, sūktas 2 and 3; II 41 and I 23. By the side of many resemblances in metre and form, they show the peculiar differences of the ritual of the three families to which they originally belonged. Some of the real hymns have introductions or conclusions revealing an astonishing uniformity. M. Bergaigne discusses the ṣastras of the hotar recited at the third pressing of the soma and in the atiratra, and those of the hotrakas. The hotar was the priest who had to recite the formulas during the different liturgical ceremonies, with the assistance of the adhvaryā who performed the offering, and the adgātā who chanted the songs, while the brahman had the oversight over the whole sacrifice; the hotrakas were the assistants of the four chief-priests and each had three such acolytes.

Other hymns seem to have been ṣastras of ancient forms, and this character we may assign with some degree of certainty to those beginning with two praśāthas, or two tricas (tiercets) of the same metre, followed by verses of different metrical form. Under this head belong VIII 1, VI 44, I 84, and even VI 52. Besides the real ṣastras there are other liturgical recitations, e. g. the three hymns in X 76, 94, and 175, which are hymns on the stones of the wine press recited by the Grāvāstut. The closing verses common to several hymns make one natu-

¹ See A. J. P. X 493.

rally think of certain paridhānīyās constantly met with in the later liturgy. Traces of ancient liturgies have been discovered in many hymns of the *Samhita* and in the conclusions in *trishṭubhs* of hymns in *jagatis*; [according to the *Prāticākhyā* of the *Ṛigveda* the seven fundamental metres are: (1) the *gāyatrī*; (2) the *ushṇih*; (3) the *anushṭubh*; (4) the *bṛihati*; (5) the *pañkti*; (6) the *trishṭubh*; and (7) the *jagati*. No. 1 has 24 syllables, the others always 4 syllables more than the preceding]. It is possible, by a careful comparison of the hymns in *gāyatrī*s (see Oldenberg in *ZDMG.* 38, 439 ff.) or in *anushṭubhs*, in *trishṭubhs* and in *jagatis*, contained in the *mandalas* and other collections, to establish the fact that several families have in very ancient time observed a distribution of these metres among the three soma-sacrifices, similar to that which prevailed in the later common liturgy. The set ritual of the *Yotishṭoma* took for its main model the ancient liturgy of the *Vaiçrāmitras* at the sacrifice of the soma-juice in the morning, of which the metre is the *anushṭubh* for the first *çastra* and the *gāyatrī* for the four others. In the family of *Kaṇva* the *trishṭubh* and the *yagati* are used very seldom, the *gāyatrī* and the *pragātha* ruling almost exclusively, leaving but scant room for the rarer metres. No distinction of metres, however, is observed in the different offerings. In all the families, except the *Kaṇva*, and perhaps that of *Gautama* before *Vāmadeva*, the *trishṭubh* was the metre of the noon-rite which belongs exclusively to *Indra*. Among the *Vāsishṭhas* the *trishṭubh* was the only metre of the *hotar* at the three sacrifices, save a few exceptions for the evening. All the families, the *Kaṇvas* always excepted, show a tendency to reserve the *yagati* for the evening sacrifice. The fragments in *gāyatrī*s of the *çastras* of the *atirātra* have been borrowed partly from the liturgy of *Kaṇva* and that of *Vāmaveda*, where they existed already in the form of fully developed *çastras*; others have undoubtedly been compiled after these models. The agreements, indicated above, have reference to the divinities principally; but at the same time they prove a distribution of divinities and metres among the several sacrifices. Certain features peculiar to the rites of the different families have served in later time to characterize such and such a day of the *sattras* or sessions. One of the most curious instances of this fact is a combination, peculiar to the liturgy of the *Vāsishṭhas*, viz. that of fragments in *dvīpadās* (dimeters) with such in *trishṭubhs*, introduced into the ritual of the three days *chandomas* of the *Samūlha-daçarātra* and in that of the fourth day of the *Vyūlha-daçarātra*.

Pp. 80-111. *Luh-Ying-Tchi Li*, the military regulations of the Emperor *Kia-Ning*, were issued in the beginning of our century with a view to reorganize the Chinese army. They were written in Chinese and *Mandshu*. *M. de Harlez* publishes a translation of selected chapters of the *Mandshu* text, to give an idea of the scope of the whole work.—The same writer continues on pp. 229-270 his studies in Chinese history and literature, with a discussion of the *I-Li*, the oldest Chinese ritual; large extracts in current French serve as specimens of the whole treatise.

Pp. 198-228, 402-427. *Stories from Berber*, by *M. de Rochemonteix*, with notes on the language of the Berber branch of the Hamitic family spoken in the southern portion of Morocco by a large population quite distinct from the Arabic invaders and only Muhammadans on the surface. This language em-

braces several branches, the chief of which are the Sûs or Shlûh spoken in the country of Sidi Hashim, south of Morocco proper, the Riff in the mountains of north Morocco, and the Kabail of Algeria. Between these widely separated countries are, all through the intervening Atlas mountains, and also in some parts of the Sahâra, more or less varying shades of the same tongue. In short, these subdialects may be said to cover the whole Atlas range from Tunis to Agadêr, and are more or less intelligible to the people speaking one of the three above-mentioned languages. These three branches of the Berber language, although analogous, are yet quite distinct, somewhat resembling in their relation to each other a group of Keltic languages, such as Gaelic, Irish and Welsh. The term Shlûh is given in Morocco by people of Arabic extraction to the Berber people, and their language is also called Shilhâ. It was doubtless the prevailing language of the whole of Mauretania before the indigenous inhabitants of the plains were driven into the mountains at the time of the Arab invasion. M. de Rochemonteix prints four interesting tales with their translation into current French which will prove of great use to the students of the Berber language. The words borrowed from the Arabic are carefully noted and given in Arabic characters at the foot of each page. Pp. 202-207 contain a primer of Berber phonetics and rules of transliteration. The stories remind us of those contained in the Arabian Nights and Grimm's fairy tales.

Pp. 297-312. M. Arthur Amiaud. The Assyrian ordinal numbers. There has been a general confusion concerning the Assyrian numerals. Cardinal numbers were classed as ordinals and vice versa. Amiaud gives the following paradigm for the ordinal numerals: (1) Numerals from 1 to 10. (a) Simple forms: masculine pa'lu and feminine pa'ultu; thus we have šanû for šanju, šalsû, ribû for rib'u, hanšu or hamšu, šiššu for šidšu, sibû for sib'u; feminine šanûtu; šalultu (V Rawl. 64, 28a), sibutu (Layard 63, 1), tešûtu (cf. te[ša], Haupt, Nimr. Ep. 54, 8). Like the other Semites the Assyrians may have had originally the common form pa'lu, reserving pa'ûlu for the numerals in connection with time. The latter encroached on the former and crowded it out; relics we find in forms like mahritu and šanitu, but such feminine forms as *ribûtu, *hamiltu and *sibûti could easily have been confounded with rebitu, street, hamiltu, five, and sibitti, seven; thus they were dropped to avoid such a confusion. (b) Composite forms: for the masculine either pa'ulû, e. g. samašurû the eighteenth, a compound of saman and ešurû (for ešerûijju); or pa'lû, e. g. samanû, to be read samēnû, for samēnijjun, see samanâ, Haupt, Nimr. Ep. 54 8; 55, 24, by the side of the simple form samnu, preserved in arah-samnu, Hebrew סָמְנוּן; or pa'lâa, e. g. šalšaa the third (V Rawl. 3, 48). Feminine forms have not yet occurred. (2) The 20th, 30th, etc., are formed from the corresponding cardinal numerals by adding the adjective ending -ijju, e. g. šalâšû the thirtieth for *šalâšâijju (IV Rawl. 23, 5a). The feminine to išten is ištât, not ištenit, as Delitzsch, Assyrian Grammar, p. 203, infers from V Rawl. 34, 28a; this passage is to be read iš-ten i-ti ša-ni = the one with the other; the feminine to edu (see V Rawl. 12, 31b) is edtu for *ahādâtû, constr. state edit. The form ahadat registered by Delitzsch, p. 210 of his grammar, from Asurn. I 81, does not exist (see ZA. II 232). The feminine to šinâ, two, is šitên, and that of kilallân, kilalên, kilallê 'ambo' is kilattân (Esarh. V 54; Neb. E. I. H. V 59). Ištânu is not a numeral adjective, as Delitzsch says, but an adverb

meaning 'once'; see IV Rawl. 1, 34 and 35b; 16, 8a, ištānu la = not once, never.

Pp. 313-354. M. Rubens Duval writes on the Patriarch Mar Jabalaha II and the Mongol princes of Azerbaijan towards the close of saec. XIII. This article is practically a review of M. Bedjan's *Histoire du patriarche Jabalaha et de Rabban Çauma* (Paris, 1888). The book throws a great deal of light upon the history of Christianity in China and Persia, and also on that of the Mongol Khans of the thirteenth century. Jabalaha was born A. D. 1245 in Koschang, near Peking; during the 37 years of his rule as patriarch he came in contact with at least seven Persian Khans. His teacher and counsellor was Rabban Çauma.

Pp. 355-363. M. J. Darmesteter publishes Pazend text and French translation of 'the duties of a student.' It shows a striking resemblance in contents to the first five chapters of the Middle-English poem, *The Schoole of Vertue*, by F. Seager, A. D. 1557.

Pp. 364-375. M. E. Senart continues his notes on Indian Epigraphy, examining seven engraved stones from Caboul.

Pp. 376-401. M. E. Drouin. The study of numismatics has yielded a number of additions to our knowledge of Oriental history. The Aramean tongue has been the commercial language of Mesopotamia since saec. VIII B. C. M. Drouin proves this by an examination of a number of Aramean coins; he also treats of the prototype of the Greek βασιλεὺς μέγας = Assyrian šarru rabû, and that of βασιλεὺς βασιλέων = Persian Shâhânshâh = Aramean Malkân malkâ = Assyr. šar šarrani. These Aramean coins as a rule show two figures, on the reverse that of the local sovereign with a simple diadem, and on the obverse that of the βασιλεὺς μέγας with the Arsacide tiara.

Pp. 428-489. M. Clément Huart, in his Turkish Bibliography, gives the titles of 320 books and periodicals in Turkish, Persian, and Arabic, published at Constantinople in 1887-1888. Attention is called to the many translations of French books, etc. (those of Victor Hugo and others). The same five divisions are observed as in the former articles. See A. J. P. II 121, III 369, VIII 377.

Vol. XIV, pp. 40-58. The Acts of Sharbil and the continuation of them, the Acts of Barsamya occupy the second place after the Doctrine of Addai or Thaddaeus, as regards their importance for the history of the Christian church of Edessa. M. R. Duval again examines them and concludes that they are of no value for history and belong to the domain of fiction.

Pp. 59-83. M. Serge Larionoff contributes the Persian text and French translation of the history of King Djemshid and the Dios.

Pp. 84-110. M. van Berchem sends an Arabic tale in the Egyptian dialect, with French translation, preceded by notes on the phonetic peculiarities of Cairo-Arabic. See also Toy in P. A. O. S. Oct. 1888, pp. cxii-cxiv.

Pp. 111-142, 197-237. M. Loret publishes a long article on ancient Egyptian flutes. Examining the descriptions of flutes found in Greek and Latin authors, he states that the μόνανλος or μόνανλος κάλαμος was a flute blown at the end. It was remarkable for sweetness, but with little power, and its modern repre-

sentative is the Old-English flute. The *φῶρυξ πλαγίανλος* is the cross-flute or German flute. The real name for the instrument flute is *σῦριγξ* or Pandean pipe, Latin *fistula*, while *αὐλὸς*, tibia, is either the clarionet, i. e. the single reed-system, or the hautbois, i. e. the double reed-system. These differences not only existed in Greece, but we can trace them back to Egypt, as shown by the reed pipes in the Egyptian collection of the British Museum, at the Louvre, in Florence and Turin, Berlin and Leyden. The Egyptians also had the credit of the many-toned flute, the *πολύφθογγος αὐλὸς*, as they had of the many-stringed instruments. There were, in fact, seven kinds of flutes among the Egyptians (p. 133). Some have three, others four holes, as is the case with 14 of those at Leyden, which are made of common reed. Some were furnished with a small mouthpiece of the same humble materials, or of a thick straw inserted into the hollow of the pipe. In appearance the instrument was a straight tube, without any enlargement at the mouth, and when played was held with both hands. Pp. 197-207 contain a descriptive catalogue of about 40 flutes, of which I will quote but one, No. 33: In the Egyptian collection of the British Museum is a small reed pipe of eight and three-quarter inches in length, and into the hollow of this little pipe is fitted at one end a split straw of thick Egyptian growth, to form its mouthpiece.—Most of the flutes were of moderate length, apparently not exceeding a foot and a half. We learn from these pipes that the Egyptians understood the principle of the bag-pipe drone, and that they played music in the pentaphonic or Scotch scale, as well as in the diatonic scale. The whole article serves to support the views of those scholars who maintain Egyptian origin for most of the Greek arts and sciences.

Pp. 143-192 contain fragments of Turkish folklore, by M. Alric; text and translation, with notes on Turkish prosody.

Pp. 238-270. M. Clem. Huart has some interesting remarks on a Pehlevi-Mussulman MS belonging to the library attached to the Santa Sophia mosque at Constantinople. It is No. 66 of the catalogue published in 1887 A. D., and has the heading: Questions touching the illustrious Koran. The MS is of quarto size, numbers 355 sheets, with 21 lines on every page; the pages, however, are not numbered. It is not a regular commentary to the Koran, but rather a treatise on cabalistic formulas occurring in the Koran, and purposes to facilitate the understanding of the Arabic text. The author is not known. At first sight the MS seems to be written in good Persian, but a close scrutiny shows besides the pure Persian a number of passages written in a peculiar dialect, called by Huart the Guébri dialect of the Parsi of Yezd, a branch of the Pehlevi-Mussulman or modern Median.

Pp. 271-363, 381-493. 'Amda Šēyōn, i. e. pillar of Zion, King of Ethiopia, ruled from 1314-1344 A. D.; he is also known as Gabra-Masqāl, i. e. servant of the cross, a name which he assumed when he became king. M. Jules Peruchon publishes the Ethiopic text with French translation of the wars of that king. The text is reprinted from No. 861 of the Oriental MSS of the British Museum. This MS contains, according to Wm. Wright's catalogue, pp. 315-318, a compendium of history, comprising: (1) the history of the Jews from Eli to our Saviour; (2) the history of the Roman Empire from Tiberius to

Heraclitus, 611 A. D. (3) Leading dates from the creation to the time of Muhammad, etc. (No. 7) The chronicles of Ethiopia, compiled A. D. 1784, by order of Dajāzmāch Hailu, in the first year of the reign of King 'Iyasu. The seventh chapter of this chronicle is the history of 'Amda Šëyōn, son of Wēdēm Ra'ād. It is one of the oldest documents for the history of Abessynia. The language is pure Ge'ez, the style readable and at times elegant; the great number of similes, comparisons and quotations from the Old and New Testament show that the author was a priest. He gives, however, not merely an enumeration of historical facts, but clothes his story in the form of an historical novel, thus making it a real literary production. We are told that under the Emperor 'Amda Šëyōn the Muhammadans had become very powerful and entirely independent. One of the king's officers having been killed by them, the king invaded their country, and defeated them so that the Muhammadans had to ask for peace. It was granted upon the condition that Haqq-ed-Dīn, their leader, be replaced by his brother Šabr-ed-Dīn. At this point the chronicle begins. After the usual invocation of the Trinity, the writer tells us how the new Mussulman king Šabr-ed-Dīn threatened the king 'Amda Šëyōn and his wife, and intended to conquer Ethiopia. 'Amda Šëyōn, made aware of these intentions, recalls to Šabr-ed-Dīn the circumstances which had brought about the defeat of his brother and predecessor, as well as the death of Darāder, another brother, and threatens him with the same punishment if he should persist in his evil resolution. Šabr-ed-Dīn answers the king with renewed insolence and defies 'Amda Šëyōn to attack him. A series of battles and fights begin, invariably terminating in favor of the king of Ethiopia. Pp. 279-326 and 381-440 contain the Ethiopic text, pp. 327-363 and 441-483 the French translation. The text is edited with the variants of the Ethiopic MS No. 143 of the Bibl. Nat. à Paris, also containing the history of 'Amda Šëyōn; to the translation are added many notes touching geography and ethnography. The writer gives also the different renderings of Father d'Almeida, whose translation is now in the British Museum, catalogued as MS No. 9861, *Historia de Ethiopia a alta ou Abassia, imperio do Abexim, cujo rey vulgarmente he chamado Preste Joani etc.*, by Padre Manoel d'Almeida (1623?). Appended is an index of proper and geographical names contained in the chronicle. Šabr-

ed-Dīn, i. e. **صبر المدين**: 'patient in the faith,' was, according to the Arabian historian, Makrizi, a nephew, not the brother of Haqq-ed-Dīn. Of interest is the popular etymology of this proper name by the Ethiopic king, who calls his adversary Sabra-Dīn, i. e. law-breaker, from the Ethiopic *sabāra*, to crush, to break; Arabic **ثَبَر** (*thābara*) and *dīn*, justice, law.

Pp. 494-525. M. C. Imbault-Huart describes two Muhammadan insurrections which occurred in the Chinese province Kan-sou in 1648 and 1781 A. D.

Nouvelles et Mélanges. Vol. XIII, pp. 112-120. M. Groff has another note on the words **קלל** and **קליו** occurring in the Egypto-Aramean papyrus at the Louvre (see A. J. P. X 492); he thinks they mean 'a sort of wine,' while M. de Vogüé, on pp. 277 ff., says they denote measures of capacity. On p. 499 Groff compares Talmudic **קלבא** with our **קליו**.—M. J. Oppert translates and inter-

pretends an Assyrian text, published by Father Strassmayer in ZA. III 147, which corroborates the statement of Justin (XLI, chap. 4) that the beginning of the Arsacide era falls in the year 256 B. C., when A. Manlius Vulso Longus and M. Attilius Regulus were consuls at Rome. The inscription speaks of a lunar eclipse in the year 232 of the Arsacide era, which exactly corresponds to the one registered under March 23 of the year 24 B. C. Oppert resumes his discussion on pp. 505-508, 509 f., and 511-514 against Epping's remarks in ZA. IV 78; also see Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 1888, p. 322 f., and ZA. IV 174-185 and 391-399.—R. Duval speaks in terms of highest praise of E. Kautzsch and A. Socin's translation of the Genesis.

Pp. 271-296. According to M. Groff, Gen. 15, 13-16 and Exod. 12, 40 belong to different recensions.—M. Jos. Halévy maintains the identity of קִפְרִיִּם with קִפְרִיִּם (Ezekiel 47, 16), a Syrian village on the frontier (cf. קִפְרִי Gen. 10, 30) between חֶמֶת and חֶמֶשׁ against those Assyriologists who identify it with the ancient Babylonian Sippara. The Syriac form of קִפְרִי occurs in the Babylonian chronicle as Shabara'in: *Σαβαρίμ*.—Ptolemy's mountain, AACAAAMOC, near the Anti-Lebanon, is a mistake for AACAAAMOC, this stands for Hebrew הַר צִלְמֹן; some minor MSS of Ptolemy really read *'Αλσάλαμος*, and still better *'Ασάλαμος*, which last is the only correct reading for הַר צִלְמֹן = הַר צִלְמֹן. We can now correct Psalm 68, 15b, and translate: On the mountain of snow, on Šalmôn, the mountain of snow being Mount Hermon. [A similar instance of such a mistake of Δ for Δ is mentioned by Lagarde. Greek AΔAMAC was read AΔAMAC by Arabic translators, this gave rise to the

Arabic الماس (*'almāsūn*), shortened finally to ماس, *māsūn*, the 'al being considered as article as in Al-Iskender for Alexander, etc.]—M. L'Abbé Martin reviews R. Duval's edition of Bar Bachlûl's Syriac Lexicon. This work, dating from saec. X of our era, is very important for the history of the translation of scientific books from Greek into Arabic and Syriac. It also gives much information to Hellenists. The publication of this lexicon by M. Duval is a masterpiece of exactness and conscientious philological work.—M. B.-M. announces E. Mercier's *Histoire de l'Afrique septentrionale depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à la conquête française* (1890), 2 Vols., and L. Pinto's *Récréations grammaticales de Hariri*.

Pp. 497-536. M. J. Halévy, in a note on the geography of Syria, believes that עֵינָא, occurring in II Kings 17, 24, or better, עֵינָא, is only the Hebrew rendering of Babylonian Gue = Assyrian Que; cf. קִדְרֵעֵי קִר = Assyrian Kudur-Lagamari; Hena and 'Iwa (i. e. חֵנֶה וְעֵוָה) in II Kings 18, 34 ought to be changed to חֵנֶה וְעֵוָה, Chani to be compared with Babylonian Hani-rabbat. The name of the god חֵרֶתֶק in chap. 17, 31, is a corruption for חֵרֶחֶן, a Syrian god often mentioned. Against Delitzsch's theory concerning the Cossaeans, Halévy defends their Semitic nationality. A list of Cossaeian forms recently published by Bezold (see A. J. P. X 491, below) proves the Semitic character of their language. Halévy examines the synonyms for Hadad-Rimmon, the god of the atmosphere, which are purely Semitic. Also see ZA. IV 205-222. The Hittites belong to the Hebrew-Phoenician branch of the Semitic family. Halévy discusses a number of proper names and shows traces of the mimma-

tion; thus Šaipar-ma = Hebrew שַׁפַּר + ma; Sapalulme = Aramean סַפְלִיל + me; Tarqutimme = Tarqûtim, connected with the name of the god Tarhun or Tarqû + me; and Urume, the city of Tarqutimme = Uru, city + me. [Another evident proof of the Semitic character of this language is the phrase blt-ḥilāni, mentioned expressly by Assyrian writers as a Hittite word; it is equal to the Hebrew בְּלִית חֵיל.]—Reviewing M. Minaïef's *Researches and materials touching Buddhism*, II, A Buddhist repository, M. L. Feer mentions that Abel Rémusat in 1824 had prepared a MS of the same contents; circumstances prevented him from publishing it. Excellent as M. Minaïef's edition is, Abel Rémusat's would have been, for various reasons, still better and more complete.—Kālidāsa's *Śakuntala* has been translated into French from a Tamil version, by M. Gérard Devèze (Paris, 1888). As the version differs from the well-known recensions of the Sanskrit text, it is to be regretted that the translator gives no particulars at all of the Tamil author. But in the dearth of our knowledge of Tamil literature we can nevertheless welcome this useful work of a promising student (L. Feer).—M. de Goeje sends an obituary of the late Dr. Wm. Wright, Sir T. Adams' Professor at Cambridge, born in India in 1830, and died on the 22d May, 1889. It is the heaviest blow that Oriental studies have sustained since the decease of the veteran Fleischer. With him the triad of comparative Semitic scholars breaks up, only two, Noeldeke and I. Guidi, remaining. Wright's lectures on the comparative grammar of the Semitic languages have been left in such a form that they can be printed, and their publication has been undertaken by the Syndics of the University Press. He was an active member of the Old Testament Revision company, and did much good service in their work.—Michele Amari, well known to all scholars as the author of the *Studies on the Sicilian Vespers* and other great works, died at Florence, July 27, 1889, honored and lamented by all as a true patriot and a man of great literary distinction.—Another loss is the death of M. Georges Guyeisse, a promising young Orientalist.—E. Mahler, of Vienna, discusses the relation of Šab'e šiltānu māt Muṣūri to Pir'u šar māt Muṣūri (Botta, p. 145, 2, ll. 1 and 3). Šabe is the Seve, So, שֶׁבֶּה of the Bible, II Kings 17, 4, the Šabaq of the XXV dynasty. Now just as Joseph became שֶׁלִיטָה עַל כָּל-הָאָרֶץ, the unlimited ruler of the country, while Pharaoh retained the title of legitimate king, so also was Šabaq-Šab'e the actual ruler, while Pir'u = Pharaoh was the royal dignitary.

Vol. XIV, pp. 193-196 contain reviews, by M. R. Duval, of A. Chabot's *Elementary Hebrew Grammar*, 3d edition, Paris, 1889, and by M. Barbier de Meynard of R. Youssouf's *Dictionnaire turc-français*, Constantinople, 1888, 2 vols., in-12.

Pp. 364-380. M. G. Bénédite gives an account of a mission to the Sinaitic peninsula.—M. E. Drouin recommends V. A. Smith, *The coinage of the early or imperial Gupta dynasty of Northern India*, London, 1889; a reprint from the XXI Volume of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.—M. R. Duval praises Max Loehr's edition of Georgii Abulfaragi Bar Ebraya's Syriac annotations to the Epistles of Paul, Goettingen, 1889.—M. Barbier de Meynard is as favorably impressed by the VI Volume of Wm. Pertsch's monumental work, *Die Handschriften-verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, containing the catalogue of Turkish MSS, as Pavet de Courteille of the preceding volumes.

Pp. 526-543. M. R. Duval has a paper on the determinative article of the Arabic dialect of Lihyān, which is the dialect of the inscriptions of El-Oela discovered by Ed. Glaser. It is written ה, rarely נ and followed by נ (n) before gutturals which are not capable of reduplication. M. Halévy, comparing it with the Hebrew article, suggests that הן (han) was the original form of the Semitic article. Duval agrees with Halévy as far as the article of the Lihyān dialect is concerned, believes, however, that in Hebrew-Aramean forms like להנהלה הנעל, להנהלה הנעל, להנהלה הנעל and להנהלה הנעל, the n is merely a nasal prolongation of the vowel.—M. Groff speaks of the land of Goshen, Joshua 10, 41 and 11, 16.—M. Eivaciji Modi, of Bombay, offers some remarks on the names of halting-places and stations between Pichaver and Caboul, quoting many popular etymologies of these names current among the inhabitants. M. Darmesteter supplies the linguistic etymologies of several places mentioned by the learned Parsi.—Obituary addresses delivered by M. Barbier de Meynard and M. Ernest Renan at the funeral of M. Pavet de Courteille, the distinguished Professor of Turkish at the College de France, born at Paris, June 23, 1821, and died Monday, Dec. 16, 1889.

Vol. XV, pp. 1-101. M. P. Sabbathier. Studies in Vedic liturgy. The Agnishṭoma according to the Çrauta-sūtra of Aṣvalāyana. The liturgical sūtras are twofold: (1) the Kalpa- or çrauta-sūtras based on revelation (çruti), that is, on the brāhmanas; and (2) the grihya- or smārta-sūtras, which rest simply on tradition (smṛiti). It is only through the study of the sūtras that we gain a true insight into the real character of the Vedic religion. They are exoteric, while the brāhmanas are esoteric. The sūtras are so complicated that it is difficult even for the best Sanskrit students to understand them. At the suggestion of the late M. Abel Bergaigne the writer has undertaken to translate the çrauta-sūtra of Aṣvalāyana, with all the supplementary explanations and the philological commentary necessitated by the enigmatic precision of the text. Of this sūtra he prints the fifth chapter, which treats of the celebration of the Agnishṭoma, the most simple form of the soma-sacrifice. The Sanskrit text is published in the Bibliotheca Indica (1864-1874), with the commentary of Gārgyanārāyana; the comparison with the other sūtras and the brāhmanas of the Ṛigveda and the Yagurveda have furnished useful help. The Agnishṭoma or praise of Agni is properly the name of the sāman or chanted strophe preceding the twelfth çastra, the Agnimārūta. Later it was used to designate the whole ceremony, which ends with this çastra.

Pp. 102-112. M. Darmesteter calls attention to the traces of Buddhism in the language spoken in Afghanistan and Beluchistan, and speaks of the original home of the Brahousis.—M. Barbier de Meynard pays tribute to the recent publication, by the Jesuit fathers at Beyrouth, of the Maqamat of Hamadani, with the commentary of Sheikh 'Abdo. Meynard gives a short biography of Hamadani, the founder of this branch of a literature which was brought to its height by Hariri a century and a half later. He also announces the appearance of the first two volumes of M. Amélineau's Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne, the whole work to be completed in 15 volumes.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Callisthenes [The false]. The History of Alexander the Great ; being the Syriac version of the pseudo-Callisthenes, ed. from five MSS, with an English tr. and notes by Ernest A. Wallis Budge. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 111 + 200 + 204 pp. 8vo, cl., \$7.50.

Cook (A. M.) Macmillan's Latin Course. Pt. 2. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 7 + 176 pp. 16mo, cl., 60 cts.

Ferguson (E. C.) An Aid to Greek at Sight ; consisting of classified lists of the chief classic Greek words, etc. Chicago, *J. C. Buckbee & Co.*, 1890. 9 + 357 pp. 8vo, cl., \$1.50.

Gildersleeve (Basil L.) Essays and Studies. Baltimore, Md., *N. Murray*, 1890. 520 pp. 4to, cl., net \$3.50.

Grove (J. H.) A Text-book of Latin Exercises. New rev. and enl. ed. Delaware, O., *L. S. Wells*, 1890. 14 + 290 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$1.25.

Jephet Ibu Ali. Anecdota Oxoniensia ; a commentary on the Book of Daniel ; ed. and tr. by D. S. Margoliouth. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 13 + 87 pp. 4to, cl., \$5.25.

Samaritan Chronicle (The) ; or, the book of Joshua, the son of Nun ; tr. from the Arabic, with notes by Oliver Turnbull Crane. New York, *J. B. Alden*, 1890. 12mo, cl., 50 cents.

ENGLISH.

Demosthenes. Orations against Philip. With introduction, text and notes by Evelyn Abbott and P. E. Matheson. 12mo. *Frowde*. 4s. 6d.

Driver (Rev. S. R.) Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. With an introduction on Hebrew palaeography and the ancient versions and facsimiles of inscriptions. 8vo, 306 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 14s.

First (A) Aryan Reader : consisting of specimens of the Aryan languages which constitute the basis of comparative philology, etc. Edit. by G. A. Schruppf. Cr. 8vo, xii-212 pp. *D. Nutt*. 7s. 6d.

Fowler (J. H.) Sportella : or, Unseen Passages for Higher Forms. 18mo, 122 pp. *Rivingtons*. 1s. 6d.

Gubbins (J. H.) A Dictionary of Chinese-Japanese Words in the Japanese Language (Tokio). Part I. A-J. Cr. 8vo. *Paul, Trübner & Co.* 7s. 6d.

Henry (Victor). A Short Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin for Schools and Colleges. Trans. second French ed., by R. T. Elliot. Cr. 8vo, 356 pp. *Swan Sonnenschein*. 7s. 6d.

Herodotus. The History of Herodotus. Translated into English by G. C. Macaulay. 2 vols. Post 8vo, 780 pp. *Macmillan*. 18s.

Livy. Book 4. By H. M. Stevenson. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 158 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s. 6d.

Livy. Book 21. Adapted from Mr. Capes' ed. With notes and vocabulary by J. E. Melhuish. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 176 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

— Legends from Ancient Rome. Adapted and edit., with notes, exercises and vocabularies, by Herbert Wilkinson. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 106 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Muir (J.) Original Sanskrit Texts on the Origin and History of the People of India. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) Vol. 1. 3d ed. Cr. 8vo, 544 pp. *Trübner*. 21s.

Plautus. The Amphitruo of Plautus. Edit. with introduction and notes by Arthur Palmer. 12mo, 326 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Plutarch's Lives. By John and William Langhorne. (Standard Library.) New ed. Cr. 8vo. *Routledge*. 2s. 6d.

Sargent (J. Y.) Models and Materials for Greek Iambic Verse. (Clarendon Press Series.) Fcap. 8vo, x-325 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 4s. 6d.

Sloman (Rev. Arthur). The Gospel according to St. Matthew : being the Greek text as revised by Drs. Westcott and Hort. With introduction and notes. 18mo, 148 pp. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Smith (P.) Syriac Lexicon (Thesaurus Syriacus). Fasciculus 8. (Clarendon Press Series.) Fol., sd. *Clarendon Press*. 36s.

Stone (E. D.) Selections from the Greek Tragedians. 12mo, 202 pp. *Livingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Thompson (F. E.) Homeric Grammar for Upper Forms of Schools. Cr. 8vo, 152 pp. *Livingtons*. 2s. 6d.

Virgil. Aeneid, Book 4. A translation, by A. A. Irwin Nesbitt. Cr. 8vo, sd. *Clive & Co.* 1s.

FRENCH.

Darmesteter (Arsène). Reliques scientifiques, recueillies par son frère. 2 vol. gr. in-8. *Cerf*. 40 fr.

Dictionnaire tonga-français et français-tonga-anglais, précédé d'une grammaire et de quelques notes sur l'Archipel par les Missionnaires maristes. In-8. *Chadenat*. 20 fr.

Havet (Louis). La simplification de l'orthographe. In-12. *Hachette*. 1 fr.

Hochart (P.) De l'authenticité des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite. Avec des photographies de 5 pages des manuscrits de Florence et de 68 lettres de Poggio Bracciolini. Gr. in-8. *Thorin*. 8 fr.

Krafft-Bucaille (Mme.) Causeries sur la langue française, le goût, la poésie champêtre. In-12. *Perrin*. 3 fr. 50.

Loth (J.) Chrestomathie bretonne (armoricain, gallois, cornique). Première partie. Breton-armoricain. Gr. in-8. *Bouillon*. 10 fr.

Recueil général et complet des fabliaux des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles, imprimés ou inédits, publiés avec notes et variantes, d'après les manuscrits par MM. Anatole de Montaiglon et Gaston Raynaud. Tome VI et dernier. In-12. *Librairie des Bibliophiles*. 10 fr.

Vossion (M.) Grammaire birmane, d'après A. Judson. Avec préface de M. L. Feer. In-12. *Leroux*. Cart., 12 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. 5. Bd., 3. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 5.40. (5. Bd. cplt. m. 14.) Inhalt: De veterum *περί ποιήματος*

doctrina scripsit Dr. Max. Consbruch. Accedunt commentarii qui circumferuntur *περί ποτήματος* Hephaestionei cum scholiis editi. vii, 127 u. xxxii S.

Alfārābī's philosophische Abhandlungen, aus Londoner, Leidener u. Berliner Handschriften hrsg. v. Frdr. Dieterici. gr. 8, xxxix, iii u. 118 S. Leiden, Brill. m. 5.

Anthologia lyrica sive lyricorum graecorum veterum praeter Pindarum reliquiae potiores. Post Thdr. Bergkium quartum ed. Ed. Hiller. 8. xxi, 381 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 3.

Bähnisch (Alfr.) Sämtliche Sätze d. Cornelius Nepos, in vollständiger od. verkürzter Form zusammengestellt u. geordnet nach den Regeln der Grammatik. gr. 8, xii, 119 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 1.80.

Baran (Ant.) Schul-Commentar zu Demosthenes' acht Staatsreden. 8. vi, 168 S. m. 4 Abbildgn. Prag, Tempsky. Leipzig, Freytag. m. 1.25; Einbd. m. —25.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Adb. Bezzenberger. 16. Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. u. 2. Hft. 180 S. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl. m. 10.

Bencker (Max). Der Anteil der Periegeese an der Kunstschriftstellerei der Alten. Diss. gr. 8, vi, 70 S. München. Leipzig, Fock. m. 1.80.

Bieler (Johs.) Üb. die Echtheit d. Lucianischen Dialogs de Parasito. gr. 4, 23 S. Hildesheim. Leipzig, Fock. m. 1.

Bogoroditzki (W.) Einige Reformvorschläge auf dem Gebiete der vergleichenden Grammatik der indoeuropäischen Sprachen. gr. 8, 10 S. Kasan. Leipzig, Stauffer. m. —40.

Brandt (Paul). Zur Entwicklung der Platonischen Lehre v. den Seelenteilen. gr. 4, 35 S. M.-Gladbach. Leipzig, Fock. m. 1.20.

Brockelmann (Carl). Das Verhältnis v. Jbn-el-atīrs Kāmil Fit-Ta'riḥ zu Ṭabarīs Aḥbār Errusul Wal Mulūk. gr. 8, 58 S. Strassburg, Trübner. m. 1.80.

Büdinger (Max). Catull u. der Patriciat, e. histor. Untersuchg. Lex.-8, 40 S. Wien, Tempsky in Comm. m. —70.

Canabutzae (Joannis). Magistri ad principem Aeni et Samothracas in Dionysium Halicarnassensem commentarius. Primum ed. atque praefatus est Max Lehnerdt. 8. xxii, 97 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 1.80.

Cicero's (M. Tullius) Werke. 74. Lfg. 8. Berlin, Langenscheidt. à m. —35. Inhalt: Rede f. Sextus Roscius aus Ameria. Verdeutsch v. Johs. Siebelis. 2. Lfg., 3. Aufl. S. 49-87.

— Oratio pro P. Sestio scholarum in usum ed. Alois Kornitzer. 8. v, 127 S. Wien, Gerold's Sohn. Cart. m. —90.

Dandin's Poetik [Kāvjadarṣa], Sanskrit u. Deutsch hrsg. v. O. Böhtlingk. gr. 8, vii, 138 S. Leipzig, Hässel. m. 10.

Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrisches Wörterbuch zur gesamten bisher veröffentlichten Keilschriftliteratur unter Berücksicht. zahlreicher unveröffentlichter Texte. 3. Lfg. gr. 4, S. 329-488. Leipzig, Hinrich's Verl. Subscr.-Pr. m. 30. (1-3, m. 91.50.)

Ebeling (Heinr.) Schulwörterbuch zu Homer's Odyssee u. Ilias. 5. verb. Aufl. gr. 8, iv, 263 S. Leipzig, Hahn's Verl. m. 1.80.

Ehni (J.) Der vedische Mythus d. Yama verglichen m. den analogen Typen

der persischen, griechischen u. germanischen Mythologie. gr. 8, iv, 216 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 5.

Einzelbeiträge zur allgemeinen u. vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft. 6. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 2. (1-6, m. 55.) Inhalt: Aegyptisch-indoeuropäische Sprachverwandtschaft. Von Carl Abel. 58 S.

Fabricius (Ernst). Theben. Eine Untersuchg. üb. die Topographie u. Geschichte der Hauptstadt Boeotiens. gr. 4, 32 S. m. 1 Taf. Freiburg i-Br. *Mohr*. m. 1.60.

Firdosi's Königsbuch [Schahname], übers. v. Frdr. Rückert. Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. v. E. A. Bayer. Sage I-XIII. gr. 8, lvi, 439 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 8.

Fisch (Rich.) Die lateinischen nomina personalia auf "o, onis." Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis d. Vulgärlateins. gr. 8, vii, 198 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 5.

Fleiter (Gerh.) De minoribus quae sub nomine Quintiliani feruntur declamationibus. gr. 8, 34 S. Monasterii Guestf. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Florilegium graecum in usum primi gymnasiorum ordinis collectum a philologis Afranis. Fasc. V et VI. 8. 76 u. 64 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. Cart. à m. —45.

Freund (Wilh.) Wanderungen auf klassischem Boden. Mit Ortsplänen u. Abbiidgn. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *Wohlfahrt*. à m. 1. Inhalt: Die griechischen Ruhmesstätten: Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis, Plataeae. 73 S.

Friedrichsmeier (Frdr.) De Luciani re metrica. gr. 8, 63 S. Kiliae, 1889. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Gerber (A.) et Greef (A.) Lexicon Taciteum. Fasc. VIII. gr. 8, S. 817-928. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 3.60.

Golling (Jos.) Commentar zu P. Ovidii Nasonis carmina selecta. Nebst Vocabularium u. grammat. Einleitg. gr. 8, vii, 194 S. Wien, *Graeser*, 1889. m. 1.90.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung m. besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte u. Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen. In Verbindg. m. Autenrieth, Ad. Bauer, Blass, etc., hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. 14. Halbbd. gr. 8. 5. Bd., 3. Abteilg. 304 S. m. 8 Taf. München, *Beck*. m. 6.50. geb. 8.20.

Hankel (Fritz). Die Ernennung u. die soziale Stellung der römischen Kriegstribunen. gr. 4, 34 S. Dresden. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Hansen (Reimer). Wörterbuch zur Xenophon's Anabasis u. Hellenika. gr. 8, vii, 176 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. m. 1.60.

Hartman (I. I.) De Phaedri fabulis commentatio. 8. 124 S. Lugduni-Batavorum. Leipzig, *Harrassowitz*. m. 2.50.

Haupt (Ernst). Kurzgefasste lateinische Formenlehre. 8. iv, 52 S. Berlin, *Friedberg & Mode*. m. —60.

Homeri Ilias. Scholarum in usum ed. Paulus Cauer. Pars I, Carm. I-XII. Ed. maior. 8. lxiv, 314 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 3.

— dasselbe. Ed. minor. 8. 267 S. Ebd. m. 1.50; Einbd. m. —25.

— dasselbe. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Gottl. Stier. 7. Hft., Gesang XIX-XXI. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. gr. 8, S. 653-733. m. 1. Ausg. B. Text u. Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hftn. S. 333-375 u. 313-348. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. m. 1. (1-7, m. 10.)

— Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Ferd. Weck. 8. Hft. Gesang XXII-XXIV. Kommentar unterm Text. gr. 8, iii u. S. 671-753. Ebd. 1.20. Text u. Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hftn. S. 301-340 u. 335-399. m. 1.20. (1-8, m. 9.)

— Odyssea rec. Arth. Ludwig. Vol. I, Ed. minor. 8. xii, 201 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. —75.

— dasselbe. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Karl Frdr. Ameis. 1. Bd., 1. Hft. Gesang I-VI. 9. bericht. Aufl., besorgt v. C. Hentze. gr. 8, xxvi, 198 S. Ebd., m. 1.35.

— dasselbe. Anhang zum 1. Hft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang I-VI. 4. bericht. Aufl., besorgt v. C. Hentze. gr. 8, 157 S. Ebd. m. 1.50.

Horatius Flaccus (d. Qu.) Sämtliche Werke, f. den Schulgebrauch erklärt. 2. Tl. Satiren u. Episteln. Erklärt v. G. T. A. Krüger. 12. Aufl. Besorgt v. Gust. Krüger. 2. Abtlg. Episteln. gr. 8, vi, 206 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 1.50.

Horaz in deutscher Uebersetzung v. Ludw. Behrendt. Mit beigegeführtem Orig.-Text. 1. Thl. Oden u. Epoden. [Mit Ausschluss der Epoden VIII u. XII.] 2. (Titel-)Aufl. gr. 8, ix, 272 S. Berlin, C. W. L. Behrendt, 1882. m. 2.40; geb. m. 3.

Jahrbuch d. kaiserl. deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Hrsg. Prof. Conze. 5. Bd., 1890. 4 Hfte. 4. 1. Hft. 77 u. 42 S. m. eingedr. Illustr. Berlin, G. Reimer. m. 16.

Jessen (J.) De elocutione Philonis Alexandrini. G. Leithaeuser, der Gigantenfries v. Pergamon u. die Laokoongruppe. Lex.-8, iv, 37 S. Hamburg, Herold's Verl., 1889. m. 2.

Kirchner (Johs. E.) Prosographiae Atticae specimen. gr. 4, 41 S. Berlin. Leipzig, Fock. m. 1.20.

Klotz (Rich.) Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik. gr. 8, x, 590 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 12.

Krebs (Frz.) Zur Rection der Casus in der späteren historischen Gracität. 3. Hft. gr. 8, 30 S. München, Lindauer. m. 1.20. (1-3, m. 3.40.)

Livii, Titi, ab urbe condita liber VIII. Für den Schulgeb. erkl. v. Frz. Luterbacher. gr. 8, 92 S. Leipzig, Teubner. m. 1.20.

Ludwich (Arth.) Scholia in Homeri Odysseae A 238-309 auctiora et emendatiora edita. gr. 4, 26 S. Königsberg, Akadem. Buchhandlg. v. Schubert & Seidel. m. —20.

Luebeck (Emil.) Das Seewesen der Griechen u. Römer. gr. 4, viii, 56 S. m. e. Lichtdr.-Taf. Hamburg, Herold's Verl. m. 3.

Martin (Paul.) Studien auf dem Gebiete d. griechischen Sprichwortes. gr. 4, 34 S. Plauen i-V., 1889. Leipzig, Fock. m. 1.

Menge (Rud.) et Preuss (Sieg.) Lexicon Caesianum. Fasc. XI. (Schluss.) Lex.-8, viii u. Sp. 1281-1428. Leipzig, Teubner. à m. 1.60. (cplt. m. 18.)

Middendorf (E. W.) Die einheimischen Sprachen Peru's. 1. Bd. Lex.-8. Leipzig, Brockhaus. m. 16.

Mittheilungen aus den orientalischen Sammlungen der königl. Museen zu Berlin. 2. Hft. Fol. Berlin, Spemann. m. 24. (1. u. 2., m. 44.) Inhalt: Der Thontafelfund v. El Amarna II. 1. Hälfte. Hrsg. v. Hugo Winckler. Nach den Originalen autogr. v. Ludw. Abel. Taf. 34-92b m. 2 Bl. Text.

Muche (Felix.) Kurzgefasste lateinische Schulsynonymik. gr. 8, v, 59 S. Berlin, Gaertner. cart., m. 1.

Müller (Heinr. Dietr.) Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte d. indogermanischen Verbalbaus. gr. 8, vi, 177 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 4.

Mueller (Lucian). De Accii fabulis disputatio. [Aus "Acta minist. inst. publ. Ross."] gr. 8, 68 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 2.

Patzig (Edwin). De Nonnianis in IV orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentariis. gr. 4, 30 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Sort.* m. 1.50.

Plauti (T. Macci) fabularum reliquiae Ambrosianae codicis rescripti Ambrosiani apographum confecit et edidit Guil. Studemund. gr. 4, xxxii, 524 S. m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. Berlin, *Weidmann.* cart. m. 70.

Prosaiker, griechische, in neuen Uebersetzungen. Hrsg. von C. N. v. Osiander u. G. Schwab. 26. u. 112. Bdchn. 16. Stuttgart, *Metzler's Verl.* à m. —50; in Halbbdchn. à m. —25. Inhalt: 26. Xenophon's v. Athen Werke. 6. Bdchn. Feldzug d. jüngern Cyrus, übers. v. Leonh. Tafel. 1. Bdchn., 7. Aufl. S. 713–820. 1889.—112. Herodot's v. Halikarnass Geschichte. Übers. v. Adf. Schöll. 9. Bdchn., 6. Aufl. S. 955–1041.

— römische, in neuen Uebersetzungen. Hrsg. von C. N. v. Osiander u. G. Schwab. 13. Bdchn. 16. Ebd. à m. —50; in Halbbdchn. à m. —25. Inhalt: Titus Livius, römische Geschichte. Uebers. von C. F. v. Klaiber. 13. Bdchn., 4. Aufl. S. 1507–1614.

Rahmer (M.) Hebräisches Gebetbuch f. die Jugend. 2. Curs., 6. stark verm. u. verb. Aufl. 8. iv, 144 S. Frankfurt a-M., *Kauffmann.* cart. m. 1.

Rosenthal (Max). Quamnam curam Athenienses post expeditionem illam a 415 in Siciliam factam rerum Siciliensium habuerint, quaeritur. gr. 4, 14 S. Gr.-Strehlitz, *Wilpert.* m. 1.

Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften v. J. Baunack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, R. Meister, P. Müllensiefen, W. Prellwitz. Hrsg. v. H. Collitz. 2. Bd., 2. Hft. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 2.60. (1. u. 2. m. 6.20.) Inhalt: Die Orakelinschriften aus Dodona. Die Inschriften Achaia's u. seiner Colonien. Bearb. v. Otto Hoffmann. S. 93–174.

Sauppe (Herm.) Variae lectiones. gr. 4, 20 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. —80.

Schädel (Ludw.) Das epische Thema der Odyssee u. die Tiresiasweisagung. gr. 4, 25 S. Offenbach a-M. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.

Schau (Rob.) De formulis, quas poetae graeci in conclusione orationis directae posuerunt. Diss. 4. 33 S. Tilsit. Königsberg i-Pr., *Koch.* m. 1.

Schulze (Ernst). Üb. Verschmelzung lateinischer Adjektiva m. nachfolgenden Substantiven zu e. Gesamtbegriffe. gr. 4, 16 S. Homburg v. d. H. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. —60.

Schwabe (Ernestus). Aelii Dionysii et Pausaniae atticistarum fragmenta collegit E. S. Accedunt fragmenta lexicorum rhetoricorum apud Eustathium laudata. gr. 8, viii, 282 S. Leipzig, *Dyk.* m. 12.

Siebert (Wilh.) Griechisches Lese- u. Übungsbuch f. die Untertertia. gr. 8, vii, 249 S. Osterode i-Ostpr., *Minning.* m. 1.50.

Sophokles' Tragödien, zum Schulgebrauche m. erklär. Anmerkgn. versehen v. N. Wecklein. 6. Bdchn. Philoktetes. 2. Aufl. gr. 8, 88 S. München, *Lindauer*, 1889. m. 1.20.

Stein (Heinr.) Lateinischer Lesestoff f. Quarta. In 2 parallelen Tln. 1 Tl. 7., durchgeseh. Aufl. 8. 98 S. Oldenburg, *Schmidt's Buchhdlg.*, 1889. m. 1; geb. m. 1.20.

Stoecker (Ernst). De Claudiani poetae veterum rerum romanarum scientia, quae sit et unde fluxerit. Diss. gr. 8, 97 S. Marburgi Cattorum. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.60.

Strassmaier (J. N.) Babylonische Texte. 7. Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Pfeiffer.* m. 20. (1-7, m. 100.) Inhalt: Inschriften v. Cyrus, König v. Babylon [538-529 v. Chr.], v. den Thontafeln d. britischen Museums copirt u. autogr. Enth. 384 Inschriften m. 5 Registern. v, 380 S.

Tacitus' Germania. Erklärt v. U. Zernial. Mit 1 Karte v. H. Kiepert. gr. 8, iv, 101 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 1.40.

Thukydides Geschichte d. peloponesischen Krieges. Übers. v. Adf. Währmund. 4. u. 14. Lfg. 8. à 32 S. Berlin, *Langenscheidt.* à m. —35.

Trautwein (Paul). De prologorum Plautinorum indole atque natura. gr. 8, iii, 60 S. Berlin, *Heinrich & Kemke.* m. 1.50.

Urbat (Rich.) Beiträge zu e. Darstellung der romanischen Elemente im Latein der Historia Francorum d. Gregor v. Tours. Diss. gr. 8, 63 S. Königsberg i-Pr., *Koch.* m. 1.

Vergili Maronis (P.) Bucolica. Hrsg. v. Frz. Hermes. 8, 34 S. Dessau, *Kahl's Verl.* m. —60.

Wachsmuth (Curt.) Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum. 2. Bd., 1. Abth. gr. 8, xvi, 527 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 12. (I. u. II, 1., m. 32.)

Wernicke (Konr.) Die griechischen Vasen m. Lieblingsnamen. Eine archäolog. Studie. gr. 8, vii, 143 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 4.

Zeitschrift, Wiener, f. die Kunde d. Morgenlandes. Hrsg. u. red. v. G. Bühler, J. Karabacek, D. H. Müller, F. Müller, L. Reinisch, Leitern d. oriental. Institutes der Universität. 4. Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 88 S. Wien, *Hölder.* m. 10.

— für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. Begründet v. A. Kuhn. Hrsg. v. E. Kuhn u. J. Schmidt. 31. Bd. Neue Folge 11. Bd., 6 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 156 S. Gütersloh, *Bertelsmann.* m. 16.

— f. ägyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde. Gegründet v. H. Brugsch, weitergeführt v. R. Lepsius, fortgesetzt v. H. Brugsch u. A. Erman. 28. Bd. hoch 4. 1. Hft. 64 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 15.

Zöschbauer (Frz.) Betrachtungen zu August Scheindler's lateinischer Schulgrammatik. gr. 8, 39 S. Wien, *Konegen.* m. —60.

ITALIAN.

Alberti (L. B.) Opera inedita et pauca separatim impressa Hieronymo Mancini curante. Firenze. 8vo. L. 19.

Eusebio. Il passaggio dantesco dell' Acheronte. Torino. 16mo. L. 1.50.

Foresti (Arn.) Saggi sulle fonti dell' epopea greca. Bologna. 16mo. 423 pagine. L. 4.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (William F.) *A Short History of the Roman People.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890.

Aristophanes. *The Birds.* With introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889. (Through Messrs. Cushing & Co., Baltimore.) 90 cts.

Cornelii Nepotis Vitae. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. von Andreas Weidner. Dritte Aufl., mit Einleitung, Namensverzeichnis u. Anhang versehen von Johann Schmidt, mit 21 Abbildungen u. 3 Karten. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. geb. m. 1.25.

Demosthenes. *The Speech against the Law of Leptines.* A revised text with an introduction, critical and explanatory notes, and an autotype facsimile from the Paris MS, by J. E. Sandys. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1890. \$1.60.

Engelbrecht (August). *Studien über die Schriften des Bischofes von Reii Faustus.* Wien, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1889. m. 3.

Eymen (W.) *Lateinische Übungssätze zur Casuslehre aus Cornelius Nepos u. Q. Curtius Rufus.* Wien, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. m. —60.

Ferguson (E. C.) *An Aid to Greek at Sight.* Chicago, *John C. Buckbee & Co.*, 1890.

Gomperz (Theodore). *Die Apologie der Heilkunde.* Eine griechische Sophistenrede des fünften vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts bearbeitet, übersetzt, erläutert u. eingeleitet von Th. G. Wien, *In Commission bei F. Tempsky*, 1890.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung, herausg. von Iwan von Müller. Vierzehnte Halbband enth. Bd. V, 3. Abtlg. (Die griechischen Sakralaltertümer und das Bücherwesen der Griechen u. Römer. Bearbeitet von Paul Stengel u. Gustav Oehmichen, mit 8 Tafeln.) München, *C. H. Bock'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.* 1890.

Hensell (W.) *Griechisches Übungsbuch im Anschluss an die Schulgrammatiken von Curtius. v. Hartel u. Gerth.* Erster Teil. Regelmässige Formenlehre bis zu den verbis liquidis einschliesslich. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1889. m. 1.50.

— *Griechisches Verbal-Verzeichnis im Anschluss an die Schulgrammatiken von Curtius. v. Hartel, Gerth u. Koch.* Dritte Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag.* Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1889. m. —80.

Hübner (E.) *Neueste Studien über den Römischen Grenzwall in Deutschland, von E. Hübner.* Bonn, *Gedruckt bei Carl Georgi*, 1889.

Lateinische Schulgrammatik. Herausg. von August Scheindler. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1889. m. 1.70.

Livi (T.) *ab urbe condita libri.* Ed. Antonius Zingerle. Pars V, Liber XXXI-XXXV. Editio maior. Vienna, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. m. 1.20. Ed. minor, m. 1.

Montgomery (D. H.) Heroic Ballads, with poems of war and patriotism. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 50 c.

Ovidius (P. O. Naso). Ausgewählte Gedichte. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. von H. S. Sedlmayer. 4to umgearb. Auflage. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1889. m. 1.20.

Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America. American Series III. Final report of investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, carried on mainly in the years from 1880 to 1885. Part I, by A. F. Bandelier. Cambridge, *John Wilson & Son*, 1890.

Platon's Euthyphron. Für den Schulgebrauch, herausg. von A. T. Christ. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. geb. m. —65.

Plauti (T. Macci) Amphitruo. Ed. with introduction and notes by Arthur Palmer. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. (Through Messrs. Cushing & Co., Balto.) \$1.25.

Rentsch (Johannes). Johann Elias Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter. Leipzig, *Paul Beyer*, 1890.

Sargent (John Young). Exemplaria Graeca. Selections from passages for translation into Greek. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1889. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* (Through Messrs. Cushing & Co., Balto.) 90 cts.

— Greek Iambic Verse. Models and materials. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889. (Through Messrs. Cushing & Co., Balto.) \$1.10.

Schenkl (Karl). Übungsbuch zum Uebersetzen aus dem Deutschen u. Lateinischen ins Griechische. Bearbeitet von Karl Schenkl. Siebente (unveränderte) Auflage. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1889. geb. 1 fl. 40 kr.

Schmidt (Johann). Commentar zu den Lebensbeschreibungen des Cornelius Nepos. Für den Schulgebr., herausg. v. J. S. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. m. 1.10.

Schmidt (Richard). Vier Erzählungen aus der Çukasaptati. Sanskrit und Deutsch. Kiel, *C. F. Haeseler*. New York, *G. E. Stechert*, 1890.

Steiner (Josef) u. Scheindler (Aug.) Lateinisches Lese- u. Übungsbuch. 1. Teil (für die Sexte). Mit einer Wortkunde. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. m. 1.60.

Sweet (Henry). A Primer of Phonetics. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1890. 3s. 6d. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* (Through Messrs. Cushing & Co., Balto.) 90 cts.

Vergil's Aeneis nebst ausgewählten Stücken der Bucolica u. Georgica. Für den Schulgebrauch herausg. von W. Klouček. Zweite verb. Aufl. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1890. geb. 1 fl. 30 k.

Ward (R. Halsted). Plant Organization. A review of the structure and morphology of plants by the written method. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 85 cts.

Wilkins (F. S.) Roman Literature. Literature Primers. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 35 cts.